DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 973 VT 003 362

By- Benjamin, Judith G.; And Others

PROS AND CONS: NEW ROLES FOR NONPROFESSIONALS IN CORRECTIONS.

National Committee on Employment of Youth, Washington, D.C.; Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Report No- JD-6001-Correction-Ser

Pub Date 66

Note- 128p.

Available from- Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402 (FS14.17/2N73, $.40)

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors- CAREER OPPORTUNITIES, COMMUNITY AGENCIES (PUBLIC), *CORRECTIVE INSTITUTIONS, EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, INDIGENOUS PERSONNEL, INSERVICE EDUCATION, JOB ANALYSIS, *MANPOWER UTILIZATION, *NONPROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL, PAROLE OFFICERS, PRISONERS, PROBATION OFFICERS, PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL, SOCIAL WORKERS, *STAFF IMPROVEMENT

Ways in which correctional institutions could make the most effective use of the available manpower supply were studied in response to the awareness of widespread unemployment during a period of economic prosperity, a shortage of service workers, and, particularly, an acute shortage of professional personnel in corrections work. The study's principle focus was on matching jobs in correctional settings with a range of individuals from the high school to the college dropout, with particular emphasis on the indigenous leader, the ex-offender, and the offender himself. New career lines could result from several approaches examined in detail: (1) The tasks now being performed by professionals could be broken up and the jobs redesigned to create viable functions for nonprofessionals, (2) Those who have been traditionally employed as nonprofessionals could, with appropriate inservice training, be upgraded to semiprofessionals and provided with career steps and training leading to professional accrediation, (3) Jobs which nonprofessionals could perform suitably could be developed to provide services not being rendered, and (4) Offenders and ex-offenders could also be employed as participants in their own rehabilitative process. Barriers to and advantages of these and other manpower innovations are discussed. An 85 item bibliography is included. (ET)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROS and CONS:

New Roles for Nonprofessionals in Corrections

VT003362
ED021973

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Welfare Administration
Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development

PROS and CONS:

New Roles for Nonprofessionals in Corrections

Prepared by
Judith G. Benjamin
Marcia K. Freedman
and
Edith F. Lynton

National Committee on Employment of Youth

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Welfare Administration
Office of Juvenile Delinquency
and Youth Development
1966

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 Price 40 cents

PREFACE

A nonprofit, nongovernmental agency, the National Committee on Employment of Youth concentrates on the problems youth face in preparing for and finding work. The Committee monitors national policies and programs to further opportunities for youth, provides research and information about the causes of, and ways of dealing with, youth unemployment.

The preparation of this document was supported by a contract with the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to the individuals and organizations who so kindly cooperated in the course of this study. Among them, special mention must be made of the following: The National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Milton Rector, Rudy Moz, and Armine G. Dikijian; the Federal Bureau of Prisons, John Galvin; the California Youth Authority, J. Douglas Grant and Joan Grant; the New York State Division for Youth, Milton Luger; Draper Correctional Center, Elmore, Alabama, John M. McKee; the Institute for Government of the University of North Carolina, Lee V. Bounds; Wayne State University, William Wattenberg and George Harris; Michigan Department of Corrections, Joseph Shelly; and the numerous other people who so generously gave of their time and knowledge.

We also wish to acknowledge the support, guidance, and assistance of Eli E. Cohen, Executive Secretary of the National Committee on Employment of Youth, and the work of Teresa Donati and Bernard Karr, associates, and Evelyn Wiener and Leocadia Struminski, secretaries.

The views expressed in this document do not necessarily reflect the position and policy of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

FOREWORD

The Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development is concerned with the improvement and expansion of correctional manpower. No one profession prepares individuals for entry into the correctional field. The disciplines from which correctional personnel are drawn cannot provide enough personnel to meet the needs. The correctional field itself has long been concerned with recruitment and training, particularly with upgrading staff variously called custodial, security, or nonprofessional.

This publication explores present experimentation with nonprofessional personnel in correctional institutions and in the community. It is further concerned with the development of new human service jobs which can provide new career opportunities for youth. The document provides guidelines for agencies interested in such experimentation and job development.

Bernard Russell
Director
Office of Juvenile Delinquency
and Youth Development
Welfare Administration

CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE iii

FOREWORD v

INTRODUCTION 1
  Manpower Problems in Corrections 2
  Description of the Study 4

Part I

MANPOWER IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Upgrading the Nonprofessional

  Introduction 9
  Methods of Upgrading the Nonprofessional 12

New Roles for Inmates

  Introduction 35
  The Inmate as "Therapist" 36
  The Inmate in Research 43
  Inmates in Education 50

Part II

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY

Probation and Parole

  Introduction 61
  The Dispute over Professionalism 62
  Possibilities for Use of Nonprofessionals 69
  Barriers to Manpower Innovations 76

New Forms of Community Treatment

  Introduction 79
  New Roles for Nonprofessionals 82
  Integrating Treatment of the Offender with Social Welfare Services 98

CONCLUSION

  Distinguishing between Manpower and Program Issues 101
  Need for Assessing Manpower Requirements 103
  Models for New Career Lines 106
  Implementing the Models 113

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 121

INTRODUCTION

An awareness that the country is facing serious manpower problems emerged in the United States in the 1960's. Until this decade, the country's natural wealth and relatively high levels of education made it possible for workers displaced from one form of employment to find jobs in another. Only during periods of economic depression were there serious unemployment problems, and even then the country could look with confidence toward a day when jobs would again become plentiful because of the expansion of existing enterprises or the creation of new ones. This was particularly true for unskilled or semiskilled workers, who expected their jobs to be either seasonal or dependent on the fluctuations of the business cycle. In general, the Nation felt no pressing need for manpower planning.

In recent years, however, this confidence has been undermined. For the first time we have seen widespread unemployment during economic prosperity. While some jobs have gone unfilled, they are relatively few in number and require training, skills, and education of the highest order. At lower levels of employment, shifting from one job to another has become increasingly difficult for experienced workers, and those seeking their first jobs find very few available. In addition, it seems that we can no longer expect increased investment in economic expansion to produce all the jobs that the population needs, since such investment is channeled increasingly into automation, and new technology and machines take the place of men.

Consequently, there has been a growing concern with manpower prospects and increasing interest in exploring the possibilities of new national policies that create new jobs. Such policies require that the Nation make decisions about the investment of public funds because different public programs afford alternative types and numbers of jobs. For instance, the same number of dollars invested in either space exploration or urban renewal will produce entirely different numbers and kinds of jobs. Also, in any one program, it still must be determined which combination of workers, with which skills, will best fulfill the intent of the program.

Manpower Problems in Corrections

These two issues—job creation and more rational manpower utilization—coincide as soon as the expansion of human services is contemplated, because in that area highly trained personnel are in short supply, patterns of service are changing, and interest has been generated in the creation of new career lines. In corrections, perhaps more than in any other social welfare field, these concerns have been recognized in all their interdependence.

Manpower in corrections has been an important issue for several years. After two years of planning, the major organizations in the corrections field agreed at a meeting at Arden House in June 1964 to establish a Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training. In January 1965, Representative Edith Green introduced legislation in Congress to assist in the funding of such a commission, and a parallel bill was subsequently introduced by Senator Joseph Clark.

Even in these preliminary steps, it has been recognized that the manpower needs in the field depend primarily on the goals of the correctional process and the kinds of programs nesessary to implement these goals. The impression is that a rehabilitative focus is, as yet, mainly embodied in demonstrations and, that while ongoing services are well established in a few areas, for the most part, the treatment of offenders is mainly custodial. The activities of probation and parole departments are, by and large, an accounting system to insure against flagrant breaches of regulations.[1]

The manpower issues to be resolved are, however, much more complex than this simple statement would seem to indicate. The issues arise not only from changes in the concept of service, but also from divergent views with respect to professionalism.

All health and welfare fields are experiencing personnel shortages, particularly at the level of fully credentialed professionals. In most of these fields, there is consensus on who these professionals are. In the field of corrections, however, this is not true. The approach to shortages, therefore, frequently contemplates an expansion of recruiting and training facilities at all levels, with subsidiary experimentation in the redesign of functions to allow for the use of technical and auxiliary personnel. In hospital services, for example, attempts to increase the supply of physicians and registered nurses have been accompanied by the addition of X-ray technicians, nurses' aides, and administrative and clerical personnel.

---

[1] Cf. Speech of Hon. Edith Green in the House of Representatives, *Congressional Record*, January 11, 1965.

In corrections, staffing patterns in most localities are less advanced. The need to upgrade standards has been expressed in general terms as the need to professionalize the various services. Advocates of professionalization have been motivated by their desire to improve the quality of administration and treatment, to provide job tenure and improve working conditions of existing personnel, and to raise public esteem for the corrections field.[2] These aims reflect an occupational structure that traditionally has been heavily nonprofessional, a fact that also accounts for a concurrent emphasis on inservice training.

Which combination of professionals is optimal remains an undecided point. The debate, particularly in probation, often appears to center around social workers, but a more accurate statement would probably discriminate between social work as the profession of choice and the acceptance of the social-work outlook for the field as a whole. Social work is seen as the most representative expression of an emphasis on rehabilitation and, therefore, it becomes roughly equivalent to an ideology for those in the field who seek to raise standards. It is a broader concept than, for example, insistence on hiring Masters of Social Work as probation officers.

Defining who is a professional is complicated by the emergence of corrections as a separate specialty. Several universities now offer one-year graduate programs, usually in the department of sociology. The curriculum leans heavily on social-work practice, but also includes course work in legal and administrative procedures. Designation as a professional is also accorded to probation and parole officers who hold only bachelor's degrees, even though the advocates of graduate social work consider them nonprofessionals. In addition to social workers, there are other professionals traditionally associated with the field, such as lawyers, teachers, counselors, psychologists, and public administrators. Fully credentialed personnel in these specialties are not only in short supply, but are also difficult to recruit for correctional services.

In 1962, only 54,000 individuals prepared for elementary school teaching, whereas the number needed to maintain current standards was more than twice that. The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has estimated that at least 2 million persons need rehabilitation counseling now and that an average of about 600 new rehabilitation counselors will be needed *annually* during the rest of the 1960 decade, to say nothing of school and vocational counselors. This annual demand exceeds considerably the supply being trained and entering the field. One of the worst situations is in social work, where the Council on Social Work Education estimated 10,000 vacancies in 1963. Agencies estimate requirements of more than 15,000 trained workers annually during the rest of the decade. Up to 1962, however, fewer than 2,500 persons were being graduated yearly from schools of social work.[3]

---

[2] Elmer H. Johnson, "The Professional in Corrections: Status and Prospects," *Social Forces* 40 (December 1961), pp. 168–176.

Even a cursory look at the manpower situation in corrections, then, quickly leads to the conclusion that the important question is *how to make the most effective use of the available manpower supply*, while at the same time developing new career lines for less educated and untrained workers who are in need of employment. The latter group requires not only special training, but also the supervision of the appropriate professionals.

As the population continues to increase, one can anticipate growth in the numbers of delinquents and criminals, with concomitant expansion of the need for personnel to deal with the problem. Meanwhile, the shift from a punitive to a rehabilitative focus is providing the occasion for broad review of occupational classifications. And this, in turn, creates the possibility of expanding employment opportunity for the unskilled unemployed.

The concept that the "products of a social problem" can make a special contribution in coping with the problem is itself a special contribution from the field of corrections.[4] This concept has developed to the point of requiring in the administration of the Economic Opportunity Act, as a way of carrying out the mandate of the act, the "maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups being served." [5]

Description of the Study

The present study, based on a six-month investigation, is directed to all the concerns outlined above, but its point of departure stems naturally from the manpower emphasis of the National Committee on Employment of Youth. Although the jobs that might be created as a result of reevaluating functions and roles and expanding services would probably *not* be youth jobs, they still represent the possibility of new career lines toward which youth might be directed. The focus of this study, therefore, is an attempt to match roles with a range of individuals from the high school dropout to the college dropout, with particular emphasis on the indigenous leader, the ex-offender, and the offender himself. However "professional" is defined, the consensus is that these people constitute the "nonprofessionals" for whom the new careers are designed.

---

[3] These estimates are contained in U.S. Department of Labor, *1963-64 Occupational Outlook Handbook.*

[4] In July 1963, with experimentation flourishing, the National Institute of Mental Health sponsored a conference in cooperation with the Youth Studies Center, University of Southern California, and the California State Departments of Corrections, Youth Authority, and Mental Hygiene. The conference, "Experiment in Culture Expansion," was a landmark in the development of this notion, as well as functioning to bring together many of the interests described above.

[5] See Sanford Kravitz, Statement before the Sub-Committee on Employment and Manpower, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on S.1807, "The Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965," May 27, 1965.

New career lines can result from several approaches:

1. The tasks now being performed by professionals can be broken up and the jobs redesigned to create viable functions for nonprofessionals.
2. Those who have been traditionally employed as nonprofessionals can, with appropriate inservice training, be upgraded to semiprofessionals and provided with career steps and training leading to professional accreditation.
3. Jobs can be developed that will provide services not being rendered which nonprofessionals can perform suitably.
4. Offenders and ex-offenders can be employed not only in the ways mentioned above, but also as participants in their own rehabilitative process.

Each of these approaches will be examined in detail in the body of this report. Together, they provide many possibilities for experimentation in manpower utilization.

Although the correctional field increasingly is being viewed as encompassing all agencies involved in the treatment and control of crime and delinquency, because of the need to limit the scope of this examination, "corrections" was restricted to those agencies traditionally included in the field—those established to rehabilitate the adjudicated offenders. Many of the roles and services described, however, can apply to the broader range of agencies.

In the first phase of the investigation, the authors reviewed literature and interviewed nationally known authorities—from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, the Children's Bureau, the Federal Bureau of Prisons, among others—on current innovations in corrections, particularly with respect to the use of nonprofessionals.

As a second phase, staff compiled material on projects of special interest and undertook a series of field trips to places where considerable experimentation is going on—including Alabama; California; New York; Washington, D.C.; Maryland; Illinois; North Carolina; Michigan; New Jersey; and Minnesota. Interviews were conducted with administrators from State correctional agencies, with university faculty members, with administrators of local youth-serving agencies, and with probation and parole departments. Visits were made to individual agencies and institutions to observe special projects in operation at a variety of correctional institutions, halfway houses, community treatment facilities, and probation and parole departments. Staff at all levels were interviewed, as well as the offenders themselves.

Examination of ongoing projects was supplemented by review of major theoretical writings in the field and interviews with a number of leading behavioral scientists and criminologists. Besides developing background knowledge on advances in corrections, staff examined publications and conducted some follow-up interviews on recent experiments in using nonprofessionals in human services.

This report seeks to combine an investigation of new developments in corrections with recent findings regarding manpower utilization. Manpower innovations are discussed in terms of three major settings—institutions, probation and parole services, and new forms of community treatment. A concluding chapter recommends guidelines for introducing nonprofessional personnel into these settings, together with models for experimentation.

In reviewing recent innovations and suggesting experimental models, the findings of this study should in no way be interpreted as a critique of current approaches or an attempt to evaluate treatment methods. Manpower recommendations are built around what seem to be the new directions in the field as defined by correctional experts. Whether these will be fruitful in the long run, whether they will affect crime rates and recidivism, are issues that correctional experts will have to explore and evaluate for themselves.

Part I

MANPOWER IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Chapter 1 UPGRADING THE NONPROFESSIONAL

Introduction

Correctional institutions in the United States comprise a large complex of staff, inmates, and facilities. No accurate count exists, however, of the number of institutions or the size of the institutional population. In addition, there are definitional problems that hinder attempts at precise measurement, e.g., do we include jails and private treatment centers among correctional institutions? According to statistics published by the Federal Bureau of Prisons in 1962, there were 229,484 inmates and 45,325 people employed in federally and State-operated institutions.[1] One expert has estimated that, if the various institutions run by county, religious, and private philanthropic organizations were added, the number would probably double.[2]

What of the caliber of people manning these institutions? The largest category of personnel within the system is employed in "Custodial Operation"—correctional officers in adult institutions, cottage parents in juvenile institutions.[3] Although the nomenclature may differ from State to State—a "correctional officer" may run the gamut from prison guard to group supervisor—the opinion of experts interviewed in this study is that the average correctional officer is undereducated, undertrained, and unversed in the goals of corrections. If we add those people employed as maintenance men or as supervisors of inmate work crews in adult institutions, the picture that emerges is of a nonprofessional system, manned largely by people untutored in correctional methods and objectives.

Many States set no educational requirements for nonprofessional personnel, and, while formal education need not be the criterion of competence, the frequent pattern of long hours for low pay[4] at what may be an unrewarding job and in a confined setting is not conducive to attracting or keeping "good people," however "good" is defined. As a former caseworker at a training school for girls observed: "Homosexuality, alcoholism, and severe emotional disturbance—hysteria, temper tantrums, and fighting—are more common among cottage parents than among residents." The fact is that institutions employ principally undereducated people from nearby rural communities who may have no conception of the urban experience and problems characteristic of offenders.

---

[1] Federal Bureau of Prisons, "National Prisoner Statistics," *Personnel,* No. 35 (October 1964).

[2] Unless otherwise indicated, all information comes from personal interviews.

[3] According to statistics published by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, approximately 65 percent of institutional staff are employed in "Custodial Operation."

Reinforcing the nonprofessional character of adult institutions is the use of inmate labor. Inmates are employed not only in prison industries and in caretaking duties but also in skilled and semiprofessional positions, primarily as clerks and teachers. Although it can be argued that with so large and varied an inmate population there may be some with the requisite skills and training to fill these higher level jobs, competence is not the deciding factor in many cases. For example, in an article in the *New York Times Magazine*, an anthropologist who served a term at a Federal correctional institution had this to say about inmate assignments:

> . . . the Classification Committee . . . is supposed to assign living quarters and jobs according to the prisoner's social and economic needs, his talents and interests. In reality, the Committee considers simply the current manpower shortage in a particular department, and how much hardship the prisoner deserves in view of his attitude toward authority. Accordingly, aged Dr. S., in the terminal stage of a chronic disease, was assigned to sorting dirty socks in the laundry. Little Joe, an expert in passing checks and a drug addict, was given a job in the hospital. The professor applied his educational experience in the kitchen, while former bookmakers worked in the library in the Department of Education.[5]

A small cadre of professional social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, physicians, and teachers is intended as the primary rehabilitative agent within the system, but generally they are concentrated within certain types of institutions—those for juveniles, who are considered more amenable to change—and in certain parts of the country. A 1959 survey of professionals in the prison system, for example, found that out of approximately 2,000 "personality-oriented professionals" in all of the State prison systems included in the data, 49.2 percent were in six States—California, New York, Wisconsin, Maryland, Massachusetts, and New Jersey —although the inmate population in these States was only 25.8 percent of the total.[6]

---

[4] In California, correctional officers earn from $5,028 to $8,196 (National Prisoner Statistics, *op. cit.*). However, California sets a high school diploma as a minimum requirement. In contrast, West Virginia offers its correctional officers a salary ranging from $2,040 to $3,480 which, according to the Federal Government would put them at the "poverty level." As an official in the State correctional system stated, "There are no established qualifications for correctional officers at the present time. Jobs go to those persons with the strongest political pull."

[5] M. Arc, "The Prison 'Culture'—from the Inside," *New York Times Magazine*, February 1965, p. 52.

The difficulty in attracting professionals to correctional institutions is only in part attributable to the nationwide shortage of trained personnel. All the features that repel the nonprofessional from working in a correctional institution apply even more to the professional.[7]

In addition to low salaries and generally poor working conditions, a more important deterrent from the professional's standpoint is the lack of professionalization. With little or no supervision or opportunity to share ideas with colleagues, the professional in the average correctional institution has scant opportunity to advance his professional knowledge. He finds his impact on policy-making limited; he feels and is, in fact, isolated from the mainstream of the institution.

> The psychological and administrative prerequisites for professionalized treatment have not emerged in most prison systems to give the professional a clear role and function within the formal organization. The treatment professional is usually 'tacked' on to a social system which evolved in an era of punitive ideology and which gives priority to custodial and industrial interests. It is regarded as a frill when it conflicts with or requires modification of custodial and industrial objectives. Furthermore, the treatment is relegated to the periphery of prison life.[8]

Under such conditions, it is not surprising that as one official observed, the professional staff "is characterized by low competence and high turnover."

There are exceptions to this poor manpower picture. Private institutions serving juveniles are a case in point. At Hawthorne

---

[6] Elmer H. Johnson, "The Professional in Corrections: Status and Prospects," *loc. cit.*

[7] In the New York City Department of Corrections, for example, correctional officers can earn as much as $9,000 a year because they constitute an organized power block. A Ph.D. psychologist, on the other hand, usually earns no more than $7,500 because generally there is no more than one per institution within the system.

[8] Elmer H. Johnson, "The Professional in Corrections: Status and Prospects," *loc. cit.*, p. 172.

Cedar Knolls and Children's Village, two residential treatment centers for disturbed delinquents in New York State, the ratio of staff to residents is one-to-one, excluding volunteers, who are even more numerous than staff. Institutions operated by probation departments in Los Angeles and Minneapolis, for example, set the same standards for their cottage parents or group supervisors as for probation officers (B.A. a minimum requirement). And the Federal system, in recent years, has done much to upgrade standards and working conditions.[9]

Yet the picture as a whole in State- and locally maintained institutions is bleak. Rehabilitation and corrections have been superimposed on a system which is simply a more humane heir to the ancient tradition of punishing the offender. Custody is still the watchword. While correctional administrators may be genuinely concerned with treatment, the line officer who carries out policy and the legislator who controls it may not be. When the New York City Department of Corrections, for example, requested funds to employ a psychiatrist, they were informed by one member of the Bureau of the Budget that, if his son or nephew could not afford to see a psychiatrist, he could see no reason why offenders should be given this "luxury."

Legislators and administrators may argue that they are seeking nonprofessionals because of their "natural" ability to relate to the offender. They may argue that they employ inmates to improve their work skills, habits and attitudes and to overcome the debilitating effects of idleness but, in reality, expediency and cost, not rehabilitation, seem to constitute the cornerstones of policy.

Methods of Upgrading the Nonprofessional

Concern with the quality of manpower in correctional institutions has increased over the past decade and a half. Although some attention is being given to increasing the number of professionals and raising educational requirements, the major thrust in institutional manpower has been toward upgrading the traditional nonprofessional and involving him in the rehabilitative process. In part, this is the result of the realization that professionally trained people will continue in too short supply to fill all the needs for "treatment" services, but it also reflects a growing belief that the nonprofessional has a vital role to play in the institution's efforts to resocialize the offender.

Research has provided the theoretical underpinnings to this movement. Starting in 1947 and continuing into the 1950's, a series of "impact" studies of correctional institutions was undertaken under the direction of Professor Walter Reckless at Ohio State University.[10] In 1958, Professor Daniel Glaser, chairman of the Sociology Department at the University of Illinois, was commissioned to conduct an investigation, supported by the Ford Foundation, of the effectiveness of the Federal correctional system. The results were published in 1964 in a 600-page volume.[11]

---

[9] Federal Bureau of Prisons statistics reveal that for all classifications of personnel, the median Federal salary is almost 10 percent higher than the median salary in State institutions. The ratio of staff to prisoners under the Federal system is 1:4.4; under the State system, 1:4.9.

These studies reached the same conclusion: the impact of the nonprofessional on the inmate is greater than that of the professional. Reckless found that custodial officers and work supervisors were most often credited as having been of help to inmates. In Glaser's study, work supervisors were cited with greatest frequency as the most-liked staff members, but custodial officers were mentioned more than any other category of personnel when the inmate was asked to name the staff member whom he most liked *or* disliked.

These findings not only indicated that in the nonprofessional the institution has a valuable resource that should be developed, but suggested the personal qualities and the type of role that would make the nonprofessional most influential.

Research on the social structure of the institution also has had a powerful impact.[12] The picture of institutional life has been portrayed by behavioral scientists as a two-caste system with an inmate "subculture" on the one hand and a ruling staff on the other, both reinforcing the authoritarian structure and mutually adjusted so as to support rather than counter criminal behavior. Action-research projects, such as the Pilot Intensive Counseling Organization (PICO) at the Deuel Vocational Institution in Tracy, California, have supported these findings.[13] An effort is now being made at Tracy and other places to experiment with new forms of institutional organization and methods of treatment, aimed at reducing the negative effects of institutionalization by developing a community in which inmates and staff are drawn closer together, both working in support of, rather than in opposition to, the purported objectives of corrections. Not only does this require a transformation of the inmate culture, but also of the staff's, to achieve a unanimity of approach and concept contrary to the prevalent dichotomy between custody and treatment that enables inmates to manipulate one staff member against another.

---

[10] For a description of these studies and their findings, see Walter C. Reckless, "The Impact of Correctional Programmes on Inmates," *British Journal of Delinquency*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (September 1955), pp. 138–147.

[11] Daniel Glaser, *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*, Kansas City, Mo.: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1964.

[12] For example, B. R. Cressey, ed., *The Prison*, New York: Rhinehart and Winston, 1961; Irving D. Grossman, *Asylums*, New York: Doubleday, 1961; Lloyd E. Ohlin, *Sociology in the Field of Corrections*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1956; Richard A. Cloward, *et al.*, "Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison," Pamphlet 15, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960.

[13] Financed by a National Institute of Mental Health grant to the Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency in Sacramento, the PICO project, during its first phase, tested the effectiveness of intensive casework and group therapy on a small sample of offenders. The results indicated to the research team that factors associated with the totality of institutional life would tend vitiate any of the possible positive effects of treatment. See Elliot Studt,

Coupled with the recent interest in developing the potential of the undereducated, the underemployed, the ex-offender, the indigenous leader, corrections has been given ample reason to upgrade its nonprofessional.

Formal Training

One way corrections is attempting to narrow the gap between the professional and the nonprofessional is through formal training programs. These are designed to give the nonprofessional some understanding of the causation of crime and delinquency, the behavior of offenders, and of the professional view of the goals and approaches in corrections. Inservice training or outside institutes, conducted by the individual institution or, more usually, by the State correctional agency, are the most common forms of training. Sometimes an outside training group—a community welfare organization or a university-based training center—may be utilized.

Programs in Minnesota furnish a good example of the range of these training devices. Here, the State Department of Corrections is taking the lead, but with the assistance and cooperation of the University of Minnesota's Training Center for Delinquency Prevention and Control.

The Department, for a long time, has offered short-term, inservice training courses for correctional officers. Until recently, these consisted of brief orientation sessions for newly appointed officers on custody and security measures, followed by some additional training in defense tactics and in the articulation of institutional programs. There also was some advanced training for established workers to acquaint them with new procedures. In 1961, however, the Department realized that it had made only a bow toward training and began an experimental, inservice program at the reformatory based on the existing services of the institution.

"Individualized Treatment in a Staff-Inmate Community," Deuel Vocational Institution, September 1960, mimeographed.

The most important aspect of this program is that it includes a cross-section of personnel who meet together in small groups. The training is focused on changing the attitudes of staff toward the inmates and toward each other. There are 12 meetings of two hours each for 24 weeks. The program has been going on for the last three years and has been well received by correctional officers.

Because the Department has found it impossible to deal adequately with the entire institutional training needs, in 1963 it enlisted the aid of the University's Training Center. The Center developed and conducted one-week institutes for a cross-section of custodial personnel from the State prison, the workhouse, the Federal prison, and the reformatory. Six were selected from each institution to establish a core of trained people. Two institutes are held annually, with a new group in each. The training is geared to provide the background knowledge to enable correctional officers to function as counselors rather than as mere custodians. The focus is on personality development and the treatment approach. Correctional officers have responded to this training better than the Department anticipated.

The University is cooperating with the Department on still another level. In 1965, it offered "a training program on basic knowledge of delinquency" [14] for the staff of Minnesota's boys' training school in Red Wing. The sessions were held at the institution. The director of the Training Center indicated that this new practice of extension training may be applied to other institutions in the future.

Besides these joint activities, the Training Center conducts other programs for correctional officers. Each year, it offers two eight-day orientation institutes for new workers in the field. The planning, operating, financing, and evaluating of these institutes are carried out in cooperation with the municipal, county, and State agencies served by this program. In addition, the University offers summer institutes aimed at developing a treatment-oriented approach on the part of a variety of practitioners in the broad correctional field. While these are directed primarily toward people classified as professionals, some nonprofessionals, particularly from other States, have participated.

Correctional leadership in Minnesota is aware that they are waging a difficult fight to break down the barriers between custody and treatment because of the lack of the kind of strong institutional support that exists in such States as California. Yet they feel that through training programs they can and, in fact, have made inroads in reshaping the outlook of the correctional institution and the role of the correctional officer.

---

[14] University of Minnesota, "Training Center for Delinquency Prevention and Control, Report on the First Year of Operations," p. 4 (mimeographed). The description of the Training Center's activities is derived from this material.

New Forms of Recruitment

Another innovation aimed at making the nonprofessional more effective is the recent attempt to recruit correctional officers and others from the same milieu as the offenders. These recruitment efforts are concentrated on the young adult in urban slums and on the ex-offender—an outgrowth of the move to use the social product of the problem in his own behalf.

So far, there has been more "interest expressed" than "action taken," but new developments in antipoverty programs suggest a trend in this direction. For example, a staff member of the Office of Automation, Manpower, and Training, together with representatives from other Federal agencies, is developing a proposal to train unemployed youth as aides in correctional agencies, but it is still in the planning stage. From current practice, only two examples can be cited—one, also a proposal incorporated into an antipoverty program; the other, part of a broader intent to utilize the potential of the ex-offender.

The New York State Division for Youth has been experimenting with employing its rehabilitated "graduates" within its own agency. In 1964, eight were selected to participate in a summer program conducted by Yeshiva University to train disadvantaged youth and a few college undergraduates to become youth workers. The eight were selected on the basis of their institutional adjustment and their behavior in the community since leaving the institution. (They had to be out and gainfully employed for at least a year.) The summer training program consisted of formal lectures, informal discussions, and on-the-job training in local youth-serving agencies.

Upon completion of this program, two of these eight "graduates" were chosen to be Youth Division aides; most of the others were placed on jobs with social agencies. Judging by the characteristics of the two aides selected, qualities of intelligence, articulateness (being able to talk the language of the streets as well as the language of the professionals), sociability, and ease in relating to the boys and commanding their respect must have weighed heavily in the choice.

The two aides have continued their training on the job in rotating assignments under professional supervision. They have worked as aftercare aides, as interviewers in a follow-up research program,[15] as the equivalent of cottage parent aides (group counselors) in a community residence, and in one of the Division's rural facilities.[16] In this latter capacity, they supervised the daily routine—waking boys in the morning, overseeing housekeeping chores, supervising work in a local hospital, and assuming some responsibility for keeping the boys occupied and orderly in their living units. They also aided in the group counseling process and, in general, were expected to provide a model for the boys to follow: "If they can make it, so can we."

---

[15] These aspects of the program are described in the chapter on community treatment.

Staff supervising the aides feel they have performed well and the aides, in turn, have responded favorably to the program. Initially, however, they faced resistance from other staff members, who resented their presence and continued to treat them as probationers. Once the aides proved they could be of use to staff, they gradually were accepted. Their supervisors feel this initial resistance might have been avoided if more staff had been involved in the planning of this new venture and if all staff had been given some orientation before the aides were employed. In addition, if the aide roles were clearly delineated, professionals would not feel their status was being threatened, nor would the nonprofessionals overstep their competence.

The role of aides, however, is still evolving; no job descriptions as yet have been prepared. Of all the tasks they were assigned, the boys themselves prefer their roles as "group counselors" because the functions are more clearly defined.

At this point, the aides are being paid (approximately $40 a week) from special funds allotted for temporary help. The Division is requesting that a regular civil service career line be established in the budget to create an aide position for its graduates in each of its facilities. The Division would then use these positions as training assignments or entry jobs for approximately three young men each year.

The Division staff feels that ex-offenders can perform valuable roles as "human services" workers. While they think that ex-offenders might provide a potential source for professional recruitment, they are mainly interested in using them to improve the Division's service. As one of the aides commented: "I'd like to feel that what I've been doing is an honorable job in itself. If a kid is constantly pressured to go back to school to become a professional, he may resent the whole business. He should be made to feel that the choice is his, and even if he doesn't go back to school, he can still perform a useful role."

So far, the two boys are uncommitted about their future with the New York State Division for Youth, but both think they will probably work with some allied agency. One has expressed an interest in becoming a police officer; the other has enrolled in a community college and will make more definite plans about a career after he has broadened his exposure to education.

---

[16] In line with the Division's policy, neither of them had "graduated" from this particular institution.

California is interested in following New York's lead but its plans are not restricted to its ex-offender population. The California Youth Authority developed a proposal,[17] calling for the recruitment of "indigenous leaders," to be trained for positions as Group Supervisor Aides (the equivalent of aides to correctional officers) in one of its institutions, the Nelles School.[18] If adopted, the program will be conducted in cooperation with Los Angeles' antipoverty organization, the Youth Opportunities Board (YOB).

Recruitment will be handled by the YOB, which will select the trainees from among its target population—unemployed, out-of-school youth between the ages of 18 and 20, of average intelligence, able to read and write, and in good health. Some may be former or current Youth Authority parolees.

The California Youth Authority will be responsible for the training and employment of these new recruits. Training will be largely on-the-job, with the aides assisting the group supervisors in their counseling and supervisory functions of overseeing the boys' daily routine in the living unit.

The chief purpose of the aide, as the Youth Authority sees it, "is to bridge the gap between staff and the ward (or inmate) culture."

> The Group Supervisor Aide by background and life experiences should be able to understand and effectively communicate with wards with a significant lessening of the barriers which exist between adult staff and wards. At the same time it is expected that as a result of the Group Supervisor Aide's training and subsequent experience he will also identify with staff and in time learn to interpret adult and societal values to socially deviant wards.[19]

Besides learning by doing, the aides would be receiving other kinds of training. In addition to on-the-spot instruction by staff, they would be brought together for group meetings to discuss problems that may have arisen. Also, formal instruction is contemplated on two levels: (1) high-school-equivalency training (a high school diploma is a requirement for Group Supervisors), and (2) an elementary course in the theory, methods, and objectives of corrections.

---

[17] This description is taken from a dittoed statement, entitled "Proposal," prepared by staff of the California Youth Authority, and from interviews with California corrections officials. The proposal was designed to be funded under Title I, Part B, of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

[18] This institution also would be the testing ground for a proposed training program for "institutional helpers," who would be assigned routine tasks in "food preparation" and "institutional maintenance." A "Proposal" to this end has been drafted for funding under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.

[19] California Youth Authority, "Proposal," *loc. cit.*, p. 3.

The Group Supervisor Aide would be a non-civil service position. The hope is that as a result of training the aides eventually will qualify for positions as Group Supervisors or for similar jobs in related agencies.

This proposal has been hanging fire for some time, largely because of administrative complications in working out the details, particularly the financial arrangements, between the two sponsoring organizations and the Office of Economic Opportunity. The corrections agency is optimistic that the proposal will be implemented in the near future and hopes that this practice of recruiting nonprofessionals from the ranks of the potential and actual offender population will be embodied in the system.

The Team Approach

A more common method of upgrading nonprofessional manpower is through staff reorganization. Increasingly, institutions for juvenile offenders are developing a pattern whereby social workers are used to supervise and train cottage parents. In this way, the professional becomes primarily responsible for staff development, while the nonprofessional becomes the general "human services" worker.

The staff organization of the Wisconsin School for Girls illustrates this pattern.[20] Each living unit has a council consisting of the social worker as chairman, the guidance teacher, and cottage personnel (nonprofessionals). The council is responsible for setting cottage policies, procedures, and the overall treatment of the individual girls.

This "team approach" is also used in the diagnostic process. A special council is assigned to the orientation cottage, composed of the intake social worker as chairman, the director of education, the chief psychologist, the chaplain, plus cottage personnel.

This structure, which gives the social worker ultimate responsibility for the "cottage life" program, was developed to:

---

[20] This description is taken from *A Handbook for Youth Counselors*, prepared and published by the Wisconsin School for Girls in Oregon, Wisconsin, an institution of the State's Division of Corrections, Department of Public Welfare. The staff organization at the Wisconsin School, however, is fundamentally the same as the structure established at some of the training schools visited by the authors, and the former head of the Wisconsin School is now director of one of these institutions.

—integrate the various disciplines and bring about maximum treatment impact on the individual girl;

—facilitate communications and understanding among all staff;

—limit girls' ability to manipulate staff; and

—minimize conflicts and present a united front to the girls.[21]

The administration feels this team approach is preferable to formal courses for nonclinical staff because, since the roles are not clearly defined, it is difficult to know what form training should take. By working closely together, the professional and the nonprofessional can determine the boundaries of their separate roles and the knowledge that needs to be acquired.

> We should not ask the Cottage Counselor (the equivalent of cottage parent) to become a caseworker or psychologist. We do not propose that she should master the bodies of knowledge which are necessary to function as a caseworker or psychologist. We are asking that she share with other staff a *professional orientation for the task at hand* . . . . Actually, both the clinician and the counselor would do their respective jobs better if they understood more about *each other's* job and the kinds of knowledge each of them develops and uses. The clinician should be let in on the experienced knowledge of the counselor and the counselor would be less frustrated if she were helped to formulate what she knows from experience in the light of the clinician's knowledge.[22]

Administrators feel that, with the social worker on the spot in the cottages, there is daily staff development of cottage parents. Issues that arise in the handling of youngsters can be ironed out immediately, with less likelihood that cottage parents will punish a child unduly or cast the social worker in the role of disciplinarian. Since cottage parents, because of their limited formal education, are unused to thinking in abstractions, the discussion of incidents as they arise on a day-by-day basis is considered a better learning experience than formal training.

Professionals seem to feel that the team approach has helped to break down the barriers between treatment and custodial personnel. They also suggest that still other measures should be taken to upgrade the cottage parent so that he can function on a truly semiprofessional level. Teachers and principals see the need for raising educational requirements because the cottage parent, in his role as counselor, is expected to help youngsters with their school work. Psychologists see the need for expanding the team to include people from their own discipline. And most appear to agree that some formal training is needed. This might eliminate the problem noted by one cottage parent who said, "I have no idea of what goes on in the institution, outside of my own cottage" —i.e., no idea of the nature or quality of the clinical and educational services offered.

---

[21] Wisconsin School for Girls, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 8–9.

Perhaps the most significant advances in the team approach are occurring in Federal institutions. In the current decade, the Federal Bureau of Prisons has adopted as a major policy direction the upgrading of the correctional officer and the development of the team approach. At the Federal Correctional Institution in Englewood, Colorado, correctional officers from all Federal institutions are being trained in the team approach. At the National Training School, the Federal institution for delinquents, an extensive demonstration project is underway to redesign the role of the correctional officer.[23] And in Federal prisons for young and adult offenders, "classification teams" are being instituted.

The team concept in classification is not a new development.[24] What is new is the attempt to involve the people who must carry out the treatment plan—line personnel including custodial staff—in the decision-making.

The move to extend this innovation to all Federal institutions is based largely on a system of staff organization developed in the fall of 1961 at El Reno, a Federal prison for youthful offenders.[25] The El Reno plan was developed by the newly appointed warden (now Assistant Director of the Bureau of Prisons), based on his experience at the Federal Youth Correctional Institution at Ashland where, under his administration, classification subcommittees were established.[26] At El Reno, the question was how to institute a similar system adapted to the needs of a much larger institution.

---

[23] This project is described in a subsequent section of this chapter, pp. 29 ff.

[24] Normally, classification is the responsibility of a top-level committee, usually consisting of the associate warden in charge of treatment, the chief caseworker (parole officer), the educational supervisor, the psychiatrist, and psychologist. A line caseworker is responsible for gathering data on the inmate for review by the committee, which decides on his initial plan of treatment, i.e., the living quarters, work assignments, and services that should be made available to him: reviews his progress and his potential for parole.

[25] The description of the El Reno program is derived from the following publications: "Treatment Management Changes at El Reno—1961," a mimeographed statement, dated October 16, 1961, prepared by the Federal Bureau of Prisons; "Evaluative Statement Concerning El Reno Classification Team System," a mimeographed document, dated March 1963, prepared by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Research and Development Division, under the signature of John J. Galvin, Assistant Director; and Daniel Glaser, *op. cit.*, pp. 201–207. Supplementary information was supplied through interviews with the Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

The key measures he proposed called for (1) combining the two positions of associate warden for treatment and for custody into one position, and (2) decentralizing treatment management by establishing "classification teams," composed primarily of line personnel. These were to serve the following objectives:

1. To reduce social distance and other obstacles to communication among personnel dealing directly with inmates or charged with evaluating and making decisions concerning them.
2. To facilitate the emergence of greater consistency in concepts personnel have concerning inmate needs and potentials.
3. To make it possible for "treatment management" to penetrate farther into the daily lives of all inmates—that is, to extend the staff's ability to know about, understand, and influence what happens to individuals as they go through their periods of confinement here.
4. To encourage upper management personnel to place more stress on their responsibilities for evaluating and planning in the area of treatment.
5. To enhance opportunities of operating personnel and line supervisors to grow professionally through giving them increased responsibility for treatment management, accompanied by guidance and training to enable them to rise to new demands.
6. Through these gains to bring about greater positive force and consistency in the impact of institutional happenings and relationships on the individual inmate.[27]

These proposals were instituted over a period of time to test them and to train and orient staff. Before the actual program was implemented in October of 1961, a seven-week summer workshop was held for all program participants. From experience in these sessions, the decision was reached to continue training after the program was instituted through biweekly seminars.

At the heart of the new system is the "classification team." There are six teams in all, corresponding to the caseloads of the six caseworkers. Each team is chaired by a departmental head and includes the caseworker, a representative from the educational and custodial departments, and the chaplain or student chaplain. Two psychologists and two psychiatrists, one of whom chairs a treatment team, serve on all teams as "behavioral consultants."

---

[26] For a brief description of the subcommittee system at Ashland, see Daniel Glaser, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

[27] Federal Bureau of Prisons, "Treatment Management Changes at El Reno—1961." *loc. cit.*, p. 6.

In addition, three others from the ranks of custodial personnel are involved in these teams. They are the Liaison Quarters Officer, the Assignment Officer, and the Admission and Orientation (A&O) Co-ordinator. These are newly created positions, established as part of the team system, with rotating assignments filled by senior, experienced correctional officers.

The Liaison Quarters Officer is primarily responsible for acting as the liaison between the treatment team and the line personnel who come into daily contact with the inmates in the living unit, in the work detail, and in recreation. There are three in all, each responsible for two caseloads. They attend all meetings of the two treatment teams of which they are members.

The Assignment Officer "is the one active link between all teams and between the teams and the associate wardens and the department heads responsible for work programs.[28] He coordinates departmental needs for inmate manpower, processes work assignments, and interviews inmates when a change is requested. He attends all team meetings and sees that decisions are implemented.

The A&O Co-ordinator performs the functions of the other two officers, but with respect to newly arrived inmates. This position was created as part of another new practice at El Reno whereby, as a second phase of the orientation process, inmates are given two different work assignments (a week at each) so that work supervisors can observe their behavior. The Co-ordinator decides on these trial assignments after talking with the inmate and other staff members. He attends any team meeting where an initial classification of a new inmate is to be discussed.

The teams meet twice a week. Reports are presented on the cases under discussion by the caseworker, the educational adviser, and the Liaison Quarters Officer or the A&O Officer. In addition, there may be reports from the chaplain and the psychiatrist or psychologist. The caseworker initiates the discussion and prepares a report, summarizing the team's evaluation and recommendations. The Assignment Officer records decisions for implementation purposes.

A Classification Committee, consisting of departmental heads and the Assignment Officer, meets weekly to review cases referred to it by the teams. Most of these people also serve on the Treatment Management Committee, which meets weekly to consider general questions of institutional management and to discuss inmate cases illustrative of these problems.

---

[28] Federal Bureau of Prisons, "Treatment Management Changes at El Reno—1961," *loc. cit.*, p. 9.

An evaluation of the new system is being conducted by a consultant psychologist. His findings to date show that more extensive information is being presented on the inmates, making for better evaluative decisions, than was true before. There is now 50 percent *more* staff time spent in direct contact with the inmates for classification purposes than under the old system, but with each team having one-sixth the former caseload and with more people taking part, each individual spends 50 percent *less* time in classification functions. "The inmate not only gets more time, but he gets it from a group of staff who are less pressured." [29]

To indicate how well custodial personnel have been able to function with professionals, a time-study was undertaken of the amount of participation at team meetings. As was to be expected, the chairman spoke more often than any other person, but three-fourths of the discussion consisted of comments by others in the group, all almost equal in their participation, with the caseworker and the Liaison Quarters Officer contributing the most.

Statistics reveal that there has been some difference in the actions taken by different teams. To deal with this problem, in addition to the regular training sessions and staff meetings, the associate warden and the chief caseworker have been relieved of their assignment as team chairmen to observe each team and provide on-the-spot staff development.

There has been some resistance from caseworkers to the team approach because they are now sharing their functions with other staff members, including less trained people. They are still the prime source of information on the inmate's background and future in the community, and the chief link between the institution and community agencies, but others now report on the inmate's behavior in the institution. On the other hand, by serving on individual teams, caseworkers are now more actively involved in decision-making. In any case, the general feeling is that, over time and through staff orientation and training, the resistance can be overcome.

Perhaps the major benefit derived from this new team approach is that custodial personnel are now given a significant role in classification, which means that treatment decisions are better implemented. Custodial staff feel "it gives them a chance to be heard, and it raises their prestige with the inmates." [30]

Besides having custodial personnel serve on individual teams, the three newly created positions for correctional officers provide a means for training custodial staff and an opportunity for advancement into prison management.

---

[29] Federal Bureau of Prisons, "Evaluative Statement Concerning El Reno Classification Team System," *loc. cit.*, p. 2.

[30] Daniel Glaser, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

> As the liaison officer and A&O Co-ordinators become expert at assessing and describing an inmate's behavior, they communicate this ability to line staff through the questions they ask and by the contents of their reports, which are frequently checked with line staff . . . it follows that these new positions provide an outstanding way of training staff for higher positions in the prison administration, for they learn all aspects of the prison's interest in an inmate, and deal with more components of staff than they would in their normal assignments.[31]

Liaison Quarters Officers particularly have played an instrumental role in getting custodial staff to support the team system. Because of their new status, however, they have found themselves faced with the same problem that caseworkers normally encounter. The inmates attempt to use them as the pivotal person to countermand the decisions of other staff members, but the officers have learned to refer complaints to appropriate staff, counseling only in selected cases where the team feels it necessary.

Evaluation is continuing. It seeks to determine, for example, whether improved inmate adjustment as observed by staff is attributable to the team system or to other factors and to acquire more definitive information on the effects of the system on personnel, inmates, and inmate-staff relationships. Findings to date indicate to the Bureau that the team approach is at least a partial answer to the need for a treatment-oriented climate in the total institutional setting, with the nonprofessional playing a crucial role.

Group Counseling

One of the major developments in corrections in recent years has been the use of various forms of group treatment in rehabilitating the offender. Since its introduction in England at the end of World War II, group treatment has had a steady rise. The theories of Sutherland and Cressey about the group identification of criminals, their shared attitudes, values, and behavior provided the theoretical underpinnings for its adoption by corrections. A variety of experiments starting in the 1950's, from "guided group interaction" at Highfields to the therapeutic communities of Maxwell Jones and Harry Wilmer, have advanced its implementation.

The most extensive experimentation with group treatment is occurring in California. This is where the first correctional therapeutic communities were tried in this country. Even more important for our purposes, this is where the first lay group counselors originated. California has used group treatment, particularly group counseling, as *the* vehicle for orienting the correctional officer and other nonprofessionals toward the treatment approach and using them as therapeutic agents.[32]

---

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 206–207.

In 1954, Norman Fenton, then Deputy Director for Classification and Treatment for the California Department of Corrections, initiated lay group counseling at Folsom Prison. He trained his group counselors by conducting some demonstrations which he had them observe and by preparing a small textbook and a manual setting forth the principles of good counseling.

He introduced the technique "somewhat opportunistically" as a way of meeting some of the inmates' needs for psychological services. He saw in group counseling a device by which inmates could gain greater control over their feelings and behavior, a device which was also "economical," since it enabled several people to be treated at the same time, with members helping each other to gain insight.

He also saw in group counseling "an excellent form of inservice training for the staff." He felt that nonprofessionals could be developed into group leaders because he saw group counseling as simply a new technique utilizing what is a natural process, "the constructive influences of human beings upon each other."

> Group counseling is valuable because it provides the means for the good officer to do what he wants to do, that is, to be of help to the inmates. He is encouraged in group counseling to express his desires to help inmates more adequately because of professional direction and supervision.[33]

Since its introduction, group counseling has spread throughout the State. There are now about 900 staff members (500 nonprofessionals) conducting group sessions for about 17,000 inmates in California institutions. Sessions are led by correctional officers, clerical workers, shop foremen, vocational teachers, and other institutional employees, as well as volunteers.

---

[32] This description of group counseling in California is based on visits to institutions and agencies where group counseling is being conducted. Sessions were observed and interviews conducted with staff at different levels. Discussions on the subject also were held with officials from correctional agencies and with criminologists and other behavioral scientists. Additional information was derived from the following publications: J. Douglas Grant, "A Strategy for New Careers Development," California Youth and Adult Corrections Agency, June 8, 1964 (mimeographed); Norman Fenton, *An Introduction to Group Counseling in State Correctional Service*, State of California, Department of Corrections, 1957; Norman Fenton, ed., *Explorations in the Use of Group Counseling in the County Correctional Program*, published for the Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California, by Pacific Books, Palo Alto, California, 1962; Norman Fenton, "Group Counseling: A Preface to Its Use in Correctional and Welfare Agencies," Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, California, 1961; and Gene G. Kassebaum, David A. Word, Daniel M. Wilner, *Group Treatment by Correctional Personnel: A Survey of the California Department of Corrections*, Board of Corrections, Monograph No. 3, January 1963.

[33] Norman Fenton, *An Introduction to Group Counseling in State Correctional Service*, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

Although strongly supported by the Director of Corrections in California, until recently this expansion of group counseling has been largely uncoordinated, uncontrolled, and unplanned. Individual institutions adopted it, some for the same reasons advanced by Fenton, others because group counseling was becoming common practice. The opinion that the nonprofessional may be especially suited to the role of group counselor because of less "social distance" between himself and the offender and the mutual learning that may take place helped to justify its expansion.

Because of its mushrooming development, there has been little uniformity. Nonprofessionals have been used interchangeably with professionals, with little staff training built into the process. In some cases, group counseling has followed the Fenton model of informal sessions centered on developing insight into the individual's attitudes and behavior; in others, it has taken the form of a question-and-answer period on institutional problems or adjustment to the community. In some cases, it has been no more than the traditional "bull sessions"; in others, group therapy is in fact being applied. The leader's methods have varied widely, from a passive role to a guiding role, from a didactic or authoritarian approach to an accepting one.

A survey of group treatment in California's correctional institutions revealed that: "Job and personal differences prevail in both attitudes toward inmates and perception of what is appropriate group leadership." [34] And a follow-up empirical study indicated that these differences in attitudes are reflected in the conduct of the groups.

Yet findings from the original survey also indicated that:

> . . . if the aim of the Department is increased support of the rehabilitation approach, then the large proportion of lay counselors who subscribe to this view is quite impressive. . . . It may be that a latent function of group counseling is the involvement of lay personnel at a time when penal philosophy stresses rehabilitation. Participation in counseling may alleviate feelings of being left out of the important work of the prison. Involvement of custodial personnel in the treatment may mean the changing of their viewpoint to that which we have labeled 'treatment.' The data indicate that those involved in the treatment program have an outlook more in

---

[34] Gene G. Kassebaum, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

line with the philosophy behind the program than do staff members who are not counselors.[35]

Supported in their view that group counseling can be an effective mechanism for reorienting correctional staff, the California correctional agency has begun to legitimize the process and exert control over the development of group counseling. Central training institutes have been established, under Fenton's direction, to train middle management people from State correctional institutions in the techniques of group counseling, with the intention of having them become the trainers in their own institutions. The training has consisted of lectures coupled with sensitivity training, where trainees have been constituted into "T" groups to learn how a group operates and their own role within it. These institutes are being evaluated by the School of Criminology at the University of California.

The State correctional agency also is experimenting with a new career line for correctional officers, in which group counseling would be combined with other functions into an integrated role that merges the custodian with the counselor. Normally, the correctional officer assumes the mantle of group counselor only an hour or so a day; the rest of the time he acts in his traditional role of custodian. Should this new "Correctional Program Supervisor" series be adopted, nonprofessionals would be competing with professionals for higher level positions. California is thus officially sanctioning and trying to institutionalize the policy of giving priority to treatment over custody. This new series is currently being demonstrated in the State's forestry camps for youthful offenders, but the intention is to have it apply to all State correctional institutions, including the therapeutic-community-type facilities where inmates assume greater responsibility and staff serves in a role similar to a team of consultants.

The major question is whether the State's efforts to emphasize treatment and develop new roles for correctional officers can be successful in its application at the local level. For example, assuming the institutional administrator is in favor of lay group counseling (not all are), will he develop a system of selection, training, and supervision needed to assure that the correctional officer handles the assignment effectively?

Observers of the training institutes have noted a wide disparity with respect to implementation within the individual institutions. In one case, where the attitude of top administration toward the institutes was favorable, a change in total staff attitudes became apparent after the trainees returned to the institution. In another case, "there seemed to be no effect, because the administration expected nothing from the institutes and refused to allow trainees to put into practice what they had learned."

---

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Observers of the work camps in which the program-supervisor position is being tested have noted very little attention being paid to staff development. If this is already an issue in the forestry camps, it will become still a bigger problem if the trend toward developing "milieu therapy" institutions accelerates because, in this context, retraining staff on all levels is the prime requisite.

The criteria for introducing effective group counseling have been clearly stated by Norman Fenton:

> . . . First, there must be acceptance and support from those in the top echelons of the agency. Second, adequate preparation, especially staff training, must be assured in advance. Third, a beginning should be made with the voluntary participation of a few genuinely interested employees. Fourth, group counseling must be introduced at first slowly and carefully. . . . Fifth, the limits of the content of the sessions and the behavior in the group session should be as fully defined as possible by the agency. And, finally, there must be some supervision, some resource person or persons to observe the group sessions and to whom the group leaders may go when they need advice regarding any phases of the conduct of group counseling.[36]

The issue for the State correctional agency and any other correctional system following California's lead is how to assure that these criteria will be met.

A Multifaceted Approach

At the National Training School in Washington, D.C., the Federal Bureau of Prisons is attempting to redefine the role of the correctional officer through a method that combines formal training, the team approach, and group counseling.

In 1961, in the interest of bringing professionals and nonprofessionals closer together, intensifying the impact of treatment on the offender, and developing a needed manpower resource, the Federal Bureau of Prisons established its Demonstration Counseling Project at the Training School.[37] In 1964, the program, which began with one cottage, was extended to the entire institution as a result of positive findings from the initial experiment.

In the original project, the correctional officers were specially selected for training as counselors. Those chosen were experienced men with demonstrated ability to "relate well" to the boys. That is, their outlook toward their young charges was nonpunitive and tolerant.

---

[36] Norman Fenton, ed., *Explorations in the Use of Group Counseling in the County Correctional Program*, *op. cit.*, pp. 13–14.

[37] More detailed information can be obtained from annual reports on the project, published by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. A briefer nontechnical report is also available, *Rational Innovation*, El Reno, Okla.: Federal Prison Industries, 1964.

In the current program, all correctional officers are expected to perform the role of "counselor" at some point during their institutional stay. The emphasis thus has shifted from testing the possibility for nonprofessionals to become counselors to using the counseling role as a device for upgrading staff.

As the program now operates, it is a nine-month cycle, with from three to four and a half hours per week of training for all officers currently entering the counseling phase of their jobs. The nine-month cycle and consequent rotation is viewed as an important aspect of the program because it enables the "veterans" to act as "secondary trainers" of incoming counselors.

The "primary trainers" are professionals, a psychologist and a group social worker, specially hired to direct the project. By employing codirectors from these two disciplines, the Bureau feels the project gains a dual focus—therapy and group dynamics.

The training sessions consist of informal discussions; no formal curriculum materials have been developed. Staff development also occurs through a variety of regularly scheduled meetings on all levels and through the "Cottage Forum," a weekly meeting of all inmates in a particular living unit, conducted by the psychologist and observed by the unit's correctional officers. Further support is provided to the counselor through case consultation.

In any given cottage, there are three counselors on duty, plus one or two correctional officers who are *former* counselors (i.e., rotated out of the counseling phase, back to custodial functions). Each cottage holds 75-80 boys, with a caseload of 25 for each counselor. The counselor holds individual sessions with each boy, starting when he first arrives and continuing, at least once a month, until the boy leaves for home. The counselor often accompanies him on the trip. He also conducts group counseling sessions with groups of 10 to 12 boys, meeting twice a week for approximately one hour, centering on personal histories and problems. His supervision of recreational activities within the cottage provides another opportunity for him to relate informally to his boys, both individually and as a group.

The nonprofessional's association with the treatment staff has been reinforced by the recently instituted practice of assigning a caseworker to the cottage staff and limiting caseloads to the boys in the cottage unit. Case management has been further integrated with the cottage life program by the development of "cottage treatment teams" for each unit, consisting of the chief counselor, the parole officer (caseworker), a representative from the educational and medical programs and from management. Formerly, case management was the responsibility of the usual top-level classification committee and liaison between the decision-making and implementation was minimal.

An evaluation of the original program showed that, while it had minor impact on the youths' eventual parole performance, the program made a significant difference in every factor used to measure institutional adjustment—academic progress, commitments to the segregation unit, early parole, etc. Since the program was extended to every cottage, the institution as a whole has had a marked decline in runaways.

The impact on staff corresponds to the impact on inmates. The project's directors feel that "the program has been instrumental in giving correctional officers more self-assurance and greater understanding of themselves and the boys; they have begun to take a *personal* interest in them."

Many of the benefits of the program, the directors feel, have resulted from the positive attitude of the administration. When the project was first initiated, the original group of trainees faced considerable "razzing" from their fellow correctional officers, but with the administration's strong support and the assurance that no risk was attached to participation in the experiment, these common institutional resistances were overcome fairly rapidly.

Insofar as the future of this project is concerned, there are several unanswered questions. By moving the program out of the experimental stage and extending counseling services to all units, the administration has had a vehicle for upgrading the training of all correctional officers. On the other hand, the project staff has questioned whether all correctional officers in the institution are capable of becoming counselors.

Another problem that presents itself results from rotation of training. One of the chief reasons for separating the custodial and counseling functions has been the need to free staff from the ordinary routines of supervising cottage life to allow time for talking with the boys. When all cottage staff have shared the same experiences, they are better able to understand each other's problems, to think of the boys in the same light, and to speak to each other on the same level. "This shared, mutual knowledge enables them to work together, instead of at cross-purposes." But the rotating system makes it difficult to implement one of the principles they are trying to introduce, namely, to have the boys identify with one staff person who can act as his surrogate parent throughout his stay in the institution.

These issues are related to each other and to the question of recruiting future correctional staff. There is no doubt that the Federal Bureau of Prisons is striving toward developing a system in which no one is strictly a custodian. It firmly believes that in the institutional setting every staff person has an impact on the inmate and that positive relationships can and must be established. To implement this policy effectively requires changes in initial selection procedures. Currently all correctional officers are chosen from civil service lists, with qualifications determined on a custodial-function basis.

One conclusion seems indicated: upgrading educational requirements will not necessarily produce the desired change in staff. The minimum educational requirement in the Federal system is a high school diploma. Some correctional officers at the National Training School are college graduates, yet the professionals most closely associated with the project have observed that "effectiveness as a counselor is not positively correlated with high educational levels. Good counselors handle boys well, know how to deal with the boys, how to control a situation, how to be flexible yet maintain discipline. While setting limits, the good counselor also shows feeling, compassion, and understanding. All these skills incorporate intangibles that diplomas cannot measure."

The Case Aide

Before concluding this discussion of methods of upgrading the traditional nonprofessional in correctional institutions, one more innovation in the Federal system should be noted—the introduction of the "case aide" position.[38]

This position was established in 1961 "to provide broader training for the individual correctional officer, to bring about a better custody-treatment understanding, and to assist the Case Worker by relieving him of some of his general duties."[39] The position is open to selected senior officers who volunteer for this assignment and who have demonstrated qualities of "articulateness, sensitivity, good judgment, intelligence, etc." After he completes his tour of duty as a case aide, he returns to his regular correctional-officer assignment, but the experience helps qualify him for promotional opportunities.

The case aide is under the immediate supervision of the Chief of Classification and Parole and works directly with two caseworkers. His duties consist of conducting "social" interviews, including the preparation of necessary forms, coordinating with the caseworker, the securing of various reports and information on the offender, and interpreting to line personnel the classification department's decisions.

---

[38] This report is based on interviews with officials from the Federal Bureau of Prisons and a typed job description entitled "Case Aide," prepared by staff at the Federal institution for youthful offenders at Ashland, Kentucky, dated February 7, 1963. A brief description of the program also appears in Daniel Glaser, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

[39] Job Description, "Case Aide," *loc. cit.*, p. 1.

Before starting on his assignment he is given a period of instruction and orientation by his supervisors on such subjects as the philosophy of the institution, the organization of the Classification and Parole Department, the policy and procedures in admission, classification, psychological services, parole and other forms of release. Those who show aptitude eventually function on a level similar to the caseworker. As one observer remarked, "if there is any difference between the caseworker and the case aide, it is in their style of communication." While a caseworker in a Federal institution need not be an M.S.W., because of his years of experience in the social-work field, he is likely to have adopted the professional jargon. The correctional officer, on the other hand, uses the layman's language, but can operate under the same set of assumptions as the caseworker.

A series of time and motion studies undertaken by the Bureau of Prisons revealed that "in the initial trial years, the casework-aide system did not contribute materially to reducing the work of the caseworker, but it was highly successful in augmenting communication among treatment staff, training staff, and line personnel." [40] The inference that can be drawn from these findings is that, while the quality of service may have improved, more still needs to be done to clarify the role of the case aide *vis-a-vis* the caseworker.

The difficulty may stem largely from resistance among caseworkers. In one institution, for example, the caseworker resigned after a correctional officer was assigned to work with him. Heretofore, he had sole authority over casework; now he found "that the correctional officer was taking his new role so seriously, and doing such a thorough job of homework, that he knew more about the cases than the professional worker." With staff turnover, this situation probably has improved, because new caseworkers who are assigned a case aide as a matter of course raise no objections to the practice.

Clarification of roles may occur in the future if permanent nonprofessional career lines in casework services are developed. This seems to be the direction the Bureau is taking, for it is now contemplating a study of personnel needs, focusing on social-work tasks and the training required to perform them. The expectation is that they will find a continuum of such tasks, many of which could be the responsibility of a clerk, an officer, or others without professional training. Through the use of the team approach, the introduction of the counselor at the National Training School and the case aide in other institutions, the Bureau is beginning to carve out some of these new roles.

---

[40] Daniel Glaser, *op. cit.*, p. 210.

Chapter 2 NEW ROLES FOR INMATES

Introduction

Paralleling the reexamination of the roles of the correctional officer is a reexamination of the role of the inmate himself. The two developments are interrelated, both merging from a conviction that barriers between inmate and staff must be broken down.

A prevalent line of thinking holds that an individual inmate's rehabilitation can be accomplished more effectively if he is involved in the rehabilitation of other inmates, and that this can be institutionalized into an organized method of rehabilitation. Ideas advanced at a conference in Norco, California, July 10-12, 1963, reflected this thinking and led to the proposal that the products of a social problem should be used in efforts to cope with the problem. An underlying assumption was that the offender, by virtue of his offender's status, will have avenues open to him for producing positive change in the behavior of other inmates that are closed to the staff, whether professional or nonprofessional.

Some of the thinking at the Norco conference was based on the experiences of the self-help movement: that people with common problems are influenced more readily through group process. Such movements, however, rely on the participants' desire for change. Correctional innovators are trying to arouse a similar desire through involving inmates in the work of the correctional institution. They see a potential force for good in the energy of the offender population, if that energy can be captured and redirected toward rehabilitative goals.

Not all the recent changes in inmates' roles occur as a result of advances in correctional theory and practice, however. Inmates in adult institutions frequently have served in a semiprofessional capacity and some of the roles that are now being described as "new" are little more than an extension of this practice. As services are expanded and new ones introduced, the need for manpower in correctional institutions increases. Largely for expediency's sake, but also to encourage the development of new work skills and future employability, the inmate is often called on to provide the needed manpower.

The Inmate as "Therapist"

Perhaps the most significant innovations in developing new roles for inmates occur in the treatment services, because of the introduction of group methods. Group treatment requires that the inmate be a participant and even a prime mover in the rehabilitative process. In group treatment, each member of the group is expected to contribute to the process of group change and be changed in turn; each member is thought capable of a contribution because of shared values, problems, and experiences. With so much of the responsibility shifted to the offender, the natural next step is to allow the offender to direct treatment sessions. This is now beginning, particularly in the therapeutic-community type of institutional setting.

The California Institute for Men

California, more than any other State, has been experimenting with new forms of intensive treatment for the institutionalized offender. One of the earliest attempts at "milieu therapy" was the Pine Hall Project,[1] established at the California Institution for Men in Chino as part of a State-financed, four-year experiment with "intensive treatment programs." The project was to test the effectiveness of a therapeutic community with a selected group of 30 young, first-time felony offenders, housed in a separate unit.

The basic treatment elements consisted of daily mass meetings oriented toward "here-and-now" behavior, followed by small "social therapy groups." Initially, staff assumed the leadership, but eventually the inmates conducted the meetings and acted as their own "social therapists," with staff serving primarily in the role of consultants.

The positions of "social therapist" or "group coordinator" were established in response to the inmates' concern over the lack of feedback from delinquent behavior to the small group sessions. The group demonstrating the strongest attachment to the project was asked to consider how this problem might be resolved. It started by keeping a logbook to record behavior incidents it felt should have been considered at group sessions. This led the group to assume the direction of these sessions.

Besides meeting with staff for daily "tutorials," the "social therapists" also asked for further assistance to gain a better understanding of themselves, particularly in their new role as group leaders. Weekly seminars were set up for this purpose. In addition, psychiatrists and the correctional innovators who were responsible for the project were available for consultation. An extension course in social therapy, conducted by the University of California, was also available to those who wished to participate. When other inmates moved into the role of group coordinators, the veterans helped to train them.

---

[1] See Dennie L. Briggs, "Convicted Felons as Innovators in a Social Development Project," *Experiment in Culture Expansion, op. cit.*, pp. 83–89.

As the project evolved, inmates played an instrumental role in selecting and orienting new inmates to the project. Feeling that they had information about prospective candidates that staff did not possess, the men organized themselves into a selection committee composed of a representative from each of the small group therapy sessions. The committee interviewed offenders who met the criteria for eligibility, usually with a staff member present, and selected those whom they felt were appropriate. It is interesting to note that the committee was less interested than staff in historical information, but more concerned about the extent of identification with the delinquent culture.

A group of men who identified strongly with the project organized themselves into a welcoming committee to counteract the "hazing" newcomers usually faced and the negative influence of the most delinquent members who usually exert the greatest pressure on new inmates. According to reports of staff, this effort met with considerable success.

The men also performed other staff functions. Inmate foremen and an inmate work-dispatcher, in cooperation with staff, planned and executed the inmates' work-crew assignments. These roles were performed in rotation so that all could experience the role of supervisor. The men also set up a program to screen, select, and train members of the group who were willing and able to act as a "night watch." One inmate undertook the assignment of serving as the project's research clerk, investigating the behavior of both inmates and staff alike and assessing the need for change.[2] Although there was always an undercurrent of resistance on the part of project staff and the administration to this increase in inmate authority, staff most closely associated with the direction of the project felt that this increasing involvement of the inmates gave them a more realistic attitude toward authority. "The important factor . . . is their real concern for each other, which is felt by others, and serves as a rationale for their actions. They have learned to set limits without punishing, which is difficult even for trained staff in a correctional institution." [3]

---

[2] The research conducted by this inmate is described in a subsequent section of this chapter, pp. 46 ff.

As an experimental program, the Pine Hall Project was given a limited life to test its assumptions, but its influence is still being felt in the California system and in other parts of the country. It also has had an impact on later developments at the California Institution for Men.

Currently, for example, the Reception Guidance Center, housed at this Institution, is experimenting with inmate-led therapy groups. No research is being done on this program; it is simply an innovation by an experimentally minded staff member with administrative backing. He is enthusiastic about this venture, but makes no claims of superiority of inmates over professionals as social therapists.[4] He is using them because he firmly believes in the group process as *the* method of treatment and feels it unlikely that there will ever be a sufficient number of professionals employed to provide service to all offenders. He prefers the inmate group leader to the nonprofessional correctional officer, but primarily because the inmate is undergoing therapy himself and, therefore, is more experienced.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Probably the greatest impact of Pine Hall has been on the program operating in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, under the Institute of Government at the University of North Carolina. Convinced of the value of the Pine Hall Project, the Institute's Training Center on Delinquency and Youth Crime wanted to adapt this model to North Carolina. With no professionals in the State corrections agency familiar with the techniques of the therapeutic community, the Training Center decided to set up such a program, using its staff as consultants but relying on parolees from Pine Hall to man the institution.

A separate custody-free, camp-type facility was established on the grounds of the University, housing some 20 first-time-commitment male offenders. Five parolees were brought in from California, selected by a staff member from Pine Hall.

Out of this original group of five, only one remained with the program. Of the others, one had never gone through Pine Hall and identified more with the inmate culture than with the objectives of staff. Two other parolees, who had been reared in a large city, found it difficult to adjust to the rural, relatively isolated town of Chapel Hill. Social outlets were few, and local mores, particularly regarding interracial contacts, made it even more restrictive. With only one experienced person left, the decision was made to use those inmates most responsive to treatment as "social therapists" for their fellow offenders.

---

[3] Dennie L. Briggs, "Convicted Felons as Innovators in a Social Development Project," *loc. cit.*, p. 87.

[4] A professional therapist in the same Institution contends that nonprofessionals and inmates themselves may be more effective than professionals because of their ease in relating and communicating with offenders.

By and large, the North Carolina program has followed the Pine Hall model, but with greater freedom and responsibility extended to the inmates. The professional role of consultant is more clearly marked since the Training Center's interdisciplinary staff does not live on the premises, but makes regular visits and is "on call" when needed. During the initial stages of the project, while the offender staff was in training, the professionals were at the camp daily. Gradually they passed the reins of responsibility to the parolee and the inmate staff.

The mass meetings are chaired by the parolee, who is the top staff person. The small group sessions are led by six inmate "social therapists." The boys as a group are expected to be responsible for all housekeeping, cooking, and general cleaning chores.

There is one very interesting departure from the Pine Hall model. Instead of working as crews around the institution, because of a State law permitting work-release, the boys work at regular jobs in the community. Two, in fact, have been working as "police aides," tutoring and counseling potential dropouts.[5]

The program at Chapel Hill has had its setbacks. The failure of the parolees is one; problems of grooming the inmate staff and achieving a common understanding of what constitutes a "therapeutic community" are others. It is not easy to distinguish between a "social therapist" and an "informer," especially if what is said in group sessions can result in expulsion from the project. There have been a number of incidents of boys' being away from camp overnight on "unauthorized leave" and, as a consequence, being committed to custody institutions. And a few, including former "social therapists," committed offenses that necessitated further legal action.

Many of these problems would be experienced in any experiment where principles, practices, and procedures are first being tested. The Training Center staff are aware, for example, that they failed to consider in advance the pressures on parolees of living in Chapel Hill.

Some observers feel, however, that the program was bound to face difficulties because of "excessive reliance" on inmates. They feel that there should have been closer, ongoing supervision by professionals. They see a built-in conflict of identification arising when inmates must perform the role of staff. Also, the work-release program, while it may mark an advance in correctional practice, added to the pressures because it put the inmates in the position of being half free and half confined.

---

[5] They have been called "police aides" because they have been working under the supervision of a local police official who originated the idea, but it has not been a police department program as such, and most referrals come from the schools.

Yet staff at the Training Center feel that, even with its checkered history, the program eventually managed to overcome the obstacles and achieve its objective—a true therapeutic community. They feel there is now a sense of common purpose among the inmates and a feeling of oneness with the project. As one indication of this, they point to the fact that the current group of social therapists, on their own initiative, decided to move from separate staff quarters into the regular living units to become a part of the community, rather than an isolated power bloc.

Now that the project has passed its trial stage, it is expected to be discontinued because of lack of funds and local support.

Synanon

The maximum use of the offender as therapist occurs in Synanon, an organization attempting to rehabilitate narcotic addicts.[6] Although Synanon is a private organization, with a voluntary membership, its structure is sufficiently similar to a correctional institution to warrant discussion in this context. It is not a form of community treatment, for it does not represent the community's response to the needs of its citizens. The headquarters in Santa Monica accepts people from all over the country. Some may have come from other Synanon establishments which function as reception and guidance centers. Although its members are not inmates in the strict sense, most of Synanon's members, as former narcotic addicts, have been inmates in a correctional institution at one time. While they are at Synanon, the organization restricts their movement. The fact that Synanon operates a unit within a State correctional system clearly identifies it with institutional programs.

One rises in the Synanon system on the basis of initiative; one must first demonstrate commitment to Synanon by such manifestations as voluntarily seeing to the care of the house, e.g., picking up cigarette butts, helping out where needed without being asked. Like the therapeutic community, total time is considered therapeutic time, and the formal vehicle for therapy is the group session called "games" or "synanons." These take place three evenings a week, in small groups of 7 to 10, with a "synanonist," a staff leader in charge. Although similar to therapy sessions, there is much more stress on "direct confrontation," on "truth-telling," or "guts-spilling," with each person expected to be the "attacked" and the "attacker." The synanonist is expected to be more astute in giving these "verbal haircuts" and in knowing when to quit. Like the inmate-therapist, the synanonist is someone who has demonstrated his identification with the aims of the organization, some insights into human behavior, and an ability to relate to people. He and his fellow leaders are groomed for their roles by the founder, who meets with them individually and in group sessions.

---

[6] For detailed accounts of Synanon, see Daniel Casriel, *So Fair A House*, New York: Prentice Hall, 1963, and Lewis Yablonsky, *The Tunnel Back: Synanon*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1965. For briefer descriptions, see Lewis Yablonsky and Charles E. Dederich, "Synanon: As a Program for Training Ex-Offenders as Therapeutic Agents," *Experiment in Culture Expansion, op. cit.*, pp. 37–48, and Gertrude Samuels, "Where Junkies Learn to Hang Tough," *New York Times Magazine*, May 9, 1965.

Synanon took the initiative in proposing to establish a unit at the State penitentiary near Reno. The corrections agency welcomed the proposal. A cell block was set aside for those inmates who volunteered to join, and a Synanon staff member was brought in to direct them. The behavior of the inmates in this Synanon group improved so markedly that they were permitted to live in unlocked cells. The commissioner later decided to use a former honor camp near the penitentiary as a Synanon facility, and Synanon members select inmates from the penitentiary for the camp.[7] As one leading corrections administrator observed after visiting the facility: "While I have never seen such low-morale facilities—rundown quonset huts stuck in the middle of nowhere—neither have I ever seen such a high-morale inmate population." Similar to other Synanon units, the camp is run by the offenders; there is one correctional officer on the premises to represent the correctional agency, to observe the proceedings, and to report to the department.

Not all correctional systems, however, are such staunch advocates of Synanon as the State of Nevada. California, for example, no longer permits parolees to live in Synanon because Synanon exercises no control or supervision over its members once they leave. Others also have objected to Synanon on this and other grounds. Some behavioral scientists have questioned Synanon's tactics, its "roughriding" of the individual, its totalitarian-like methods that affect human dignity;[8] the mystique that surrounds it; and the insistence that "it takes one to know one." They have likened Synanon to the army: there is a chain of command, orders are given, and those who perform them well are promoted. The more prestigious jobs are likely to go to the better educated because they are the more articulate.

---

[7] It is interesting to note that the present synanonist at the State penitentiary is a former inmate who was paroled directly to the Synanon establishment in Reno.

Synanon's critics also question its claims to success. Although no accurate statistics are kept and there is no follow-up, Synanon admits to a 40 percent failure rate—those who "split" or leave Synanon before the group feels they are ready and are assumed to be back on the streets taking dope. Of the approximately 1,200 who have been members at one time or another, only 40, or 3 percent, have left "cured." The "success" that Synanon refers to is the current membership of some 540 people who are living "clean" in Synanon and who are now dependent on the organization instead of on narcotics.

Some advocates suggest that for many drug addicts there may be no "cure." Their dependency may be so great that a sheltered existence may be the only way out. Between Synanon, in which they are able to assume productive roles in a community of their fellows, and a correctional institution, where the cost is greater and the morale is lower, the obvious choice is Synanon.[9]

Regardless of the dispute over the effectiveness of Synanon, it is of interest from a manpower viewpoint because it illustrates the possibility of utilizing the offenders and ex-offenders as "therapeutic agents." The arguments Synanon advances for its self-help approach is that the addict understands his fellow addict better than anyone else, that he cannot be "conned" so easily as the outsider, and that he does not patronize the addict as the professional tends to do. It is this patronizing attitude, the sense of "we-they," Synanon feels, that thwarts other efforts at treatment. By using ex-narcotic addicts as staff, it provides the newcomer with role models he can emulate.

Discounting the total rejection of the professional, Synanon's ability to make productive use of narcotic addicts in running the organization suggests that their self-help approach may offer some guidelines for correctional agencies.

---

[8] See Gilbert Geis, "Changing Criminals: Volleyball vs. the Orgasm," in *Experiment in Culture Expansion*, *op cit.*, p. 120.

[9] This line of thought parallels the thinking of Synanon's founder, who is hoping to develop a Synanon community for some 5,000 people with residences, meeting halls, recreation, art and cultural centers, shops, and schools—essentially a New Town for narcotics addicts.

The Inmate in Research

The theoretical foundation for recent efforts to involve the inmate in research is similar to that for the effort to employ him as a "social therapist." In both cases, the inmate is being asked to participate, to become a partner with staff in the belief that this participation can facilitate rehabilitation. In research, as in group work, some believe that inmates can make unique contributions.

Some attempts to employ inmates in research, however, have little relation to theories of rehabilitation. This is particularly true of inmates employed as technicians in data processing.

The Inmate as Technician

The earliest example of the inmate functioning as a research technician comes not from corrections *per se* but from the armed services and the work with "military nonconformists." In 1954, a group of psychologists developed a program to test the therapeutic-community type of living groups established by the Navy at Camp Elliott to rehabilitate Navy and Marine offenders.[10]

The amount of data collected made it impossible for the small professional staff to do the complete job of data analysis. The naval command, consequently, assigned one of its chief hospital corpsmen to this task. While he was not a high school graduate, showed poor verbal ability, and had had no prior experience in statistics or research, tests indicated superior intelligence and a particular aptitude for mathematics. His performance proved his potential. Within a few months, he had built up a semiautomated data-processing center employing 42 confined men (retrainees), supervised by other corpsmen under his direction. The center was responsible for population accounting for the command as a whole and for special studies for other naval facilities, as well as for the coding, filing, typing, analysis, and computation of the data resulting from the original project.

This experience was repeated several years later when the same group of psychologists undertook research at the California Medical Facility at Vacaville. They asked an inmate who was assigned to them as a clerk to help with the statistical data analysis. The result was that he became the first inmate member of the institution's present data-processing center.

The inmates at Vacaville, as at Camp Elliott, are selected on the basis of their willingness to do the work, related experience, and a "good record" in the institution. There are no formal selection procedures nor any formal training. Inmates acquire skills by observing and doing. As they display increasing competence, they are given work of increasing complexity. When an inmate is discharged, a replacement is generally available.

---

[10] The material on which this description is based appears in Joan Grant, "The Industry of Discovery: New Roles for Nonprofessionals," California Department of Corrections, no date (mimeographed).

The staff at Vacaville stressed that they are "solely interested in the service and the product that is turned out." There is no carryover between the skills learned while in the institution and jobs obtained once discharged. In the six years since the center has been in operation, only three former inmates have been employed in related work and all three were involved with the original project.[11]

Inmates currently employed by the center do not anticipate a career in data processing. They point to the problems of obtaining bonding and the preempting of entry jobs by women. Employers normally will not credit their institutional experience toward jobs above entry level. The inmates view their work at the center as an institutional assignment. One inmate observed: "I have to put in the time, and this is a good way to do it."

People associated with the center feel, however, that when the inmates have been involved in research projects on which they worked in partnership with professionals, morale has been higher and a sense of commitment has developed.

Though the current inmate technicians have no permanent interest in their jobs, staff supervising them feel they perform better than workers on the outside. "They take less time, have a lower error rate, and a higher interest in the quality of their product." The California corrections agency, however, still is resisting any attempt to use this inmate-manned unit as the central vehicle for all its data-processing operations. Observers of the program feel that, because of staff turnover, intermittent supervision, and a lack of training, there may be justification for the agency's position, but contend that problems could be resolved with administrative support for extending the inmates' responsibility.

In addition to the Vacaville center, there are two other examples of inmates being trained to do data processing. In Indiana, an inmate-manned tabulating department at the State reformatory performs all the statistical reporting for the institution, including monthly and annual movement reports for the Division of Probation, data processing for graduate students engaged in research at nearby universities, and special reports for the Board of Corrections and other State agencies.[12] In Michigan at the State Prison in Jackson, inmates work as computer programers for the State Highway Department.[13]

---

[11] The first inmate technician, after he was paroled, passed a civil service examination (the State credited his inmate experience) and was rehired by the center in a regular research capacity. He has since been discharged from parole and is working in an advanced research position with the State. The other two inmates, at the instigation of the professionals on the project, were hired by the Youth Studies Center at the University of Southern California.

The initiative for the Indiana program was taken by an inmate who was a college graduate experienced in the use of computers.[14] In Michigan, the program was engineered by the State Highway Department. In both cases, formal screening procedures were instituted (intelligence, achievement and aptitude tests, and personal interviews), and a formal course of study was developed.

At the Indiana Reformatory, the course is taught by inmates who have completed this training and have undergone a trial teaching period. Special classes have been created for custodial and civilian personnel, and training has been extended to the State prison and the girls' school. In the latter both inmates and staff attend class.

As of January 1964, 90 inmates at the Indiana Reformatory had been given some training in electronic data processing. Fifteen had completed all three phases of the course and were awarded a data-processing certificate endorsed by the Central Indiana Chapter of the Data Processing Management Association. Four of the 15 who were paroled were employed at jobs in data processing, while two others were looking for work in the field.

Observers of the inmate-manned center at the Reformatory report high morale among the inmates. The inmates function on the honor system, and only one disciplinary incident has occurred since the unit was established. There have been other problems connected with the program, however. Many inmates have failed the course because of difficulty with mathematics or an inability to comprehend the application of computers, and a review of some evaluative reports issued by the unit indicates a lack of sophistication in research design and analysis.

In contrast to the Indiana program, the course at the Jackson,

---

[12] Information on the Indiana program comes from Joan Grant, *loc. cit.*, pp. 24–33. For additional published accounts, see "EDP Behind Prison Walls," *Business Automation* (May 1962), pp. 34–36; "A Controlled Training Environment to Challenge the EDP Industry," *Data Processing Digest* (1963), pp. 19–23; and David E. Van Buskirk, "Correctional Education Through Electronic Data Processing," *American Journal of Corrections* (January–February 1964), pp. 16–18.

[13] A brief description of this program appears in a mimeographed statement prepared by the staff at the State Prison in Jackson.

[14] He was later transferred to the State Prison to set up a data-processing system for all six of the State's correctional institutions. After his parole he was appointed to the post of Assistant Director of Classification and Treatment in the Department of Corrections.

Michigan, prison is taught by instructors from computer manufacturers, one of which helped the State Highway Department develop the course. The operations of the unit are supervised also by experienced civilians, a programer, and an assistant assigned by the State Highway Department.

Statistics compiled in August 1962 revealed that of the original group of 22 who enrolled in the program in September 1961, 12 were still with the unit, 5 were on parole, and 5 had dropped out. Of the 5 parolees, 2 were working as computer programers, and a third was being considered for such a position.

The programs cited in this section indicate that inmates can be employed in data processing for correctional agencies. They also indicate that, while mathematical ability, intelligence, and statistical aptitude may be required to comprehend the work, years in school need not be a criterion. Of the original group of 22 who were trained at the prison in Jackson, for example, 20 had had less than a 10th grade education, yet the average I.Q. was over 130. Statistics on the other programs probably would reveal similar findings.

The Inmate as Investigator

No formal program can be cited in which inmates are trained to engage in operational research for correctional agencies. On the other hand, there have been isolated cases of inmates engaging in individual research.[15] Currently the California correctional agency is experimenting with a project training inmates for new roles involving assessment and evaluation—but of programs outside the correctional system.

One of these isolated cases involved a female inmate at the Federal Women's Prison who, on her own and without the knowledge of staff, undertook a study and prepared a report on the attitudes of her fellow prisoners toward treatment to support her contention that therapeutic services should be expanded.[16] She, however, had prior training and experience.

Another case was reported on at the Norco conference by the inmate who did the research.[17] His research methods and findings warrant summarizing.

In his report to the Norco conference, this inmate noted that he first became interested in undertaking a study of the attitudes of his fellow project members[18] because of remarks made by a visiting parole officer to the effect that parolees have nothing to contribute to the community. In considering what contribution they could make, he decided that they were in a unique position to help the community examine the problem of crime and delinquency. At the suggestion of a leading criminologist who was visiting the institution, he broached the possibility of undertaking research as his full-time institutional assignment. With administrative approval, he was appointed to the specially created position of Special Projects Research Clerk.

---

[15] In addition to the two examples cited in this section, a third is mentioned in the description of the program at the Draper Correctional Center, which appears in a subsequent section of this chapter, pp. 52 ff.

[16] This example appears in Joan Grant, *loc. cit.*, p. 41.

[17] Dane Werner, "Measuring the Motive," *Experiment in Culture Expansion*, *op. cit.*, pp. 91–96.

He started with a series of questionnaires, from which he drew a profile of the men housed in his unit—their years of schooling, their criminal pattern, etc.

> I probed into how the men spent their leisure time. I faced them with the fact that the average man spent over 40 percent of his leisure time in front of the television set. I examined the racial distribution and discovered that, with the voluntary system of choosing which bed he would like to sleep in, the unit had formed "Harlems," ghettos, and barrios. I drew together the similarities of the men that formed cliques and found that the program had social classes and a great deal of status could be gained by belonging to them. I implanted rumors among them and discovered their gossip chain. I discovered their attitudes toward the delinquent element among them. It was not long before I found that this was indeed a community.[19]

He next turned his attention to studying staff activities.

> I examined the staff log in which daily entries revealed the activities of the men as seen by the staff. I drew charts indicating the rate of entries as compared to influencing events within the community that might cause fluctuation. I determined how some of the staff members had pet groups which seemed to be the subject of the lion's share of their entries. I questioned them as to how they saw their own roles and was often met by expressions of indignation or fear that I, an inmate, should be in a position to ask such things. By the conclusion of my study I could determine, with a degree of accuracy, which staff members were functioning on an effective level and, even though I did not reveal my findings until later, the statistics predicted that two of the staff members would leave the project.[20]

---

[18] This was the inmate, mentioned earlier, who undertook research for the Pine Hall Project.

[19] Dane Werner, "Measuring the Motive," *loc. cit.*, p. 92.

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 93–94.

He also undertook an experiment to test the difference in response to research undertaken by an inmate or by a member of the professional staff. Together with a staff researcher, he designed another series of questionnaires which they both distributed separately to inmates and staff. The results showed significant differences. On the questionnaires distributed by the inmate-researcher, there was an 80 percent return, compared with 31 percent for those distributed by the staff researcher. On the other hand, only 10 percent of the staff responded to the inmate's questionnaires, while there was a 100 percent response to the professional's.

Whatever questions may be raised about the validity of his findings or his report, this inmate clearly demonstrated that he was able to acquire a fundamental grasp of techniques and concepts of applied research. His report also indicated that there are advantages and disadvantages in using inmates in research, suggesting the value of a collaborative approach.

This is the direction California is now pursuing in its New Careers Development Project, operating out of the California Medical Facility at Vacaville. The purpose of this project is to train inmates and graduate students to work as "change and development teams." Combining the skills of group work with those of research, teams are expected to assess social problems, stimulate action to meet them, and then evaluate and feed back information on the action taken to continue the process of change and development.

Twenty-four inmates have been accepted for the project and 8 are currently undergoing training, with 2 already released on parole. All have at least a high school education and 2 have had some exposure to college. Because the teams will be working in the community, their training and functions will be described in Part II of this report, but the theoretical basis of this project and the method of selecting the inmates relate to the issue of employing inmates in correctional research.

The 24 inmates were selected on the basis of a plan developed by the project's directors. Because the directors were interested in working with a group of young men who were not maximum-custody cases and were likely to have an early parole, they contacted the State's forestry and fire-fighting camps for possible candidates. They asked the inmates to nominate the person in their group-therapy sessions who seemed most suitable for the project. The directors then did the final screening and selection. Criteria included willingness to participate, "commitment to personal rehabilitation, and a desire to help others".

The directors have used the group-therapy sessions as their initial screening device because essentially they view the project as an extension of group treatment. Apart from the services the teams are to render, the project is conceived as a rehabilitative device, similar to group treatment. The directors feel that:

> Learning, including value and attitude change, is most rapid, permanent, and usable when it is a vital function of some purposeful activity, game or system perceived by the learner as important to himself. . . . Learning is more effective when it results from the effort to find answers to self-initiated questions. . . . Learning to understand one's self becomes a way of learning to understand others and to understand social phenomena in general. Self-knowledge is thus not an end in itself but a way of helping the individual develop a coherent and personally satisfying world view.[21]

Group counseling sessions provide the forum for self-analysis and analysis of the problems that confront others as individuals and as members of the group. The qualities that come into play in group sessions are the same as those demanded of change and development teams, except that instead of focusing on a psychological analysis of attitudes and behavior, the focus is broadened to a sociological analysis of the conditions shaping those attitudes to introduce change into the system.

Given this set of assumptions and a bias toward using the product of a social problem in an examination of that problem, it follows that the project's directors would be training their teams to conduct operational research in correctional institutions —and, apparently, this has been one of their objectives. In a speech before a forestry camp workshop,[22] the project's originator presented a design for a camp program patterned after the therapeutic community, which called for the equivalent of change and development teams. These "self-study" teams, composed of staff and inmates, would be responsible for defining the institutional problems to be investigated, developing an appropriate plan of action, evaluating the operations of the plan, and feeding back information to the total community. At the same time, they were to assess their problems of working together as a team.

So far, however, this design has not been implemented. Perhaps the State correctional agency is waiting for the outcome of the New Careers Development Project before experimenting with the use of inmates in assessing their own activities. There are indications that, should the agency decide to proceed in this direction, it can expect to face strong opposition from line staff and institutional administrators. The research clerk at the Pine Hall Project, for example, encountered such resistance. Correctional personnel will not welcome an evaluation of their work, especially by those over whom they have authority. Control over inmates is still given priority in most institutions.

---

[21] J. Douglas Grant, "Forestry Camps: Program Evaluation and New Program Trends," a position paper prepared for the Forestry Camp Workshop, sponsored by the Delinquency Study Project, Southern Illinois University, November 1964, p. 21 (mimeographed).

[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 22–26.

Even some advocates of participation question this extension of the inmate's role. Trustworthiness, they feel, is essential when the inmate is operating on this level of responsibility, and they are not sure there is an infallible method for identifying those who can be trusted. They question the method of selection adopted by the New Careers Development Project on the grounds that inmates who emerge as the natural leaders in group-counseling sessions may not necessarily be those most committed to change and rehabilitation but, rather, those who are best able to "con" the system and manipulate others.

The project's directors are aware of this problem, but feel that the inmates' loyalty and sense of commitment can be developed while they are undergoing training, through the project itself. One of the current trainees admitted his main interest in participating in the project initially was to avoid the "hard labor" characteristic of the forestry camp, but he was then unaware of the nature of the project and is now enthusiastic about it. Whether he and his fellow trainees are now "conning" the project or honestly identifying with it can only be determined by the work they produce. Their performance as trainees has been impressive, but the real test will come once they have been paroled and have worked in the community for some length of time.

Inmates in Education

The provision of educational services by inmates is not a new phenomenon, at least in adult institutions. What is new is the interest in using them by design and not merely for expediency's sake. The three examples described in this section show the variety of innovation that is occurring.

State Prison of Southern Michigan

At the maximum-security prison in Jackson, Michigan, an adult education program is being manned by inmate-instructors. The director and his four department heads are civilian, licensed teachers, but the rest of the staff are inmates.

The interesting feature of this program is the training the inmate-instructors receive. For six weeks, seven hours a day, they are given formal classroom instruction by the professionals in teaching methods, including the use of audiovisual and programed materials and, in general, concepts of learning drawn from educational psychology, measurement, and evaluation. At the end of this period, they are assigned to experienced inmate teachers for inservice training. As part of this training, they go through the course they are to teach and must successfully complete it before being given a classroom assignment.

Basically, the inmate-instructors are self-selected, although there are certain criteria they must meet—an average I.Q. and a 10th to 12th grade achievement level. They are screened by the classification committee, the civilian teachers, and, most important of all, their inmate supervisors.

The director feels that if their interest is engaged, a wide variety of people can qualify for this work. The one improvement he would like to see would be the addition of more civilian, professional teachers to work in teams with the inmate-instructors. He then would be able to offset the limitations of the nonprofessional—his limited teaching skills and knowledge of the subject—while capitalizing on his greater ability to communicate with the men. The professional, he feels, tends to direct his material toward the middle class person of average intelligence, a rarity in the prison setting.

Fricot School

The one example found of a program established with the stated purpose of exploring the therapeutic value of the teaching role again comes from California. From its experience in using inmates in the treatment process and the experience gained from experiments in education,[23] the California Youth Authority has designed a program calling for the use of older wards as teaching aides in an institution for younger wards.[24] The aides are to be selected from the population at one of the youthful-offender institutions. They must be 17 to 20 years old, high school graduates, good custody risks with no history of "sexual misconduct or of arson," and with at least four months more to serve.

The program has recently begun with one aide who underwent training and is currently employed at the training school at

---

[23] For example, the Flint Youth Study's experiments with using sixth graders, including some who are behavior problems. as helpers with kindergarten youngsters. For a brief description, see Frank B. W. Hawkinshire, "Training Needs for Offenders Working in Community Treatment Programs," *Experiment in Culture Expansion, op. cit.* pp. 27–36.

[24] The description of this program is taken from the Department of Youth Authority's Fifth Annual Report, *The Status of Current Research in the California Youth Authority*, March 1965, pp. 8–9 (mimeographed), supplemented by interviews with administrative staff of the Youth Authority.

Fricot, where he is working with 12- and 13-year-old delinquents. In addition to assisting the teacher in the classroom by serving as a tutor, he also acts as an aide in the recreational program, officiating at games and helping to lead group activities. In general, he is expected to develop a positive, informal relationship with these younger offenders. Although his primary duties are those of a teaching aide, both through formal and on-the-job training, he is being groomed to serve as a general human services worker in the hope that eventually he may be employed as a group supervisor.

Once other aides have been selected, the planned evaluation can be put into effect. This will include operational research plus comparative studies. Factors to be investigated will include the aides' skills and performance in carrying out their duties, their ability to get along with staff, and the costs of employing them in this program as opposed to regular institutional treatment. There will also be a comparison made of the parole performance of those who are selected to become aides with those who are not, but are also eligible.

Draper Correctional Center

Possibly the most significant innovations in education in the institutional setting are occurring at the Draper Correctional Center, a medium-security facility for youthful offenders at Elmore, Alabama. This institution runs "the only full-time, self-instructional school in the country." [25] The method employed is "programed instruction."

From a manpower point of view, it is significant that the school is being conducted largely by nonprofessionals. While overall supervision and direction are provided by professionals, direct assistance to the students is offered by a team of inmates (the Service Corps) and a team of college students (the College Corps).

The Service Corpsmen spend half the day as students taking courses in the school; the remainder of their time is devoted to their program assignments. A few perform clerical functions, one acts as librarian and another serves as a guide to visitors, but the majority of the seven act as "subject-matter counselors." As such, they are expected to assist and manage the students in the classroom where their particular subject is being taught. They keep progress charts on their students, determine when they are ready to take tests in a particular course, help them with any problems that may come up in understanding the material, and assist in the designing of tests. These "counselors" are chosen on the basis of competence; they must already have completed the full curriculum in the particular subject area, must be interested in working as instructors, must be liked by the boys and command their respect ("be both physically strong and strong in character"). In addition, they must also be "free from adherence to the 'criminal code.' "[26]

---

[25] John M. McKee, "Reinforcement Theory and the 'Convict Culture.'" Experimental Project in Education and Rehabilitation, Draper Correctional Center, Elmore, Ala., September 1964.

The College Corpsmen are their first-level supervisors. They prepare and administer final tests, supervise the record system, manage the educational materials stock, help Service Corpsmen analyze special learning problems, provide appropriate tutoring and curriculum assignments, and assist Service Corpsmen and other advanced students in the "college readiness" class with their studies. They work closely with the professional staff and serve as a link between them and the Service Corps. The College Corpsmen submit weekly reports on their activities. Those who are receiving college credit for their work also have required reading. Usually there are two College Corpsmen in the school at any one time.

Besides the corpsmen, other nonprofessionals are also rendering professional-level service. Of particular interest is the class of inmates who are being trained to become technical writers. Draper has recently started a vocational training program supported by the Manpower Development and Training Act. The vocational instructors hired for this program serve as the "subject matter specialists" for the technical writers, who are developing programed materials in the trade areas.

The class is conducted by the chief programer, a professional with advanced training in education and psychology, who has developed programed materials for private industry. The students, who volunteer for this class, are selected on the basis of aptitude and achievement tests. They must show good verbal ability and be able to pass the California Achievement Test (high-school-equivalency).

The students are given formal classroom instruction plus on-the-job training. Each of the 12 inmates is assigned to a vocational instructor, whom he interviews two hours a day in order to learn the specifics of the subject he is to describe. He supplements this information by reading manuals and textbooks. The chief programer prepares him for this task by discussing with the class the general questions they should ask and charting a system for them by which the information is organized and written on a step-by-step basis. Ability to use the dictionary and the typewriter is essential. Besides learning the techniques of technical writing, the students are also taught general concepts of educational psychology.

---

[26] John M. McKee, *loc. cit.*, p. 8.

While this phase of the educational program at Draper is too new to be evaluated, staff members have observed that the students' competence has proved better than expected.[27] Lack of formal education has not interfered with their ability to comprehend the material and, in fact, has been a boon to the teacher, because they have no vested interest in a particular theory which would make them resist the teacher's interpretation of the material. Their training should equip these inmates for technical-level jobs in private industry, but 10 of the 12 students have set more advanced goals for themselves, with the thought that a college education will put them in a better competitive position for employment. Although the average schooling of the group is 10th grade, the staff feels they are all college material.

On the whole, the self-instructional school at Draper is considered by correctional experts to be an advance in the field. Since the school was first established, for example, there has been approximately a 45 percent decrease in the number of disciplinary actions taken against inmates.

Of 650 inmates at Draper, about 100 attend the self-instructional school, with others on the waiting list. The average education-equivalence gain for the students has been three years in six months. Thirty boys have passed the California Achievement Test; 10 have advanced to the college readiness class; and 8 are on parole attending colleges, 5 through PACE (Program for Achievement of a College Education) scholarships supplied by Draper. On the other hand, there has also been a 7 percent dropout rate.

Some people assert that the program's success can be attributed to the advantages of programed learning over traditional methods. On the other hand, one expert observer has suggested that perhaps the program's success is due less to its method of instruction than to the way in which it has been organized and developed. Its location makes it physically accessible to the inmates, its uniqueness makes them feel they are partners in an experimental venture, and the status of the Service Corps gives the inmates the feeling

---

[27] The one problem noted was attributed, not to the students, but to the vocational instructors, who would not or could not explain what they were doing in a systematic step-by-step manner. Some staff members felt that, because technical writers have no prior knowledge of the subject, they can empathize more with the students for whom they are writing than the vocational instructors can.

2

that they are responsible for the program's outcome and have models toward which to aspire.[28]

While the staff at Draper may give more weight to the value of programed instruction, they probably would agree that other factors are also important. They would be less enthusiastic about the Service Corps and more enthusiastic about the College Corps. In any case, however, as one program official observed, if he had his choice he "probably would not use professional teachers in the role now being performed by inmates and college students," although he would welcome more specialists on a consultative basis, particularly to develop an effective guidance program.

The college students can serve as a bridge between the inmates and the professional staff. Since they are closer in age to the inmates and are not part of the official authority structure of the institution, they can relate more informally to the inmates, providing a learning experience for both groups. While, in the past, not all proved successful in relating well to the inmates, staff feels that with improved methods of screening and orientation and a detailed job design, they now have the means to develop a corps of college students who can function as effective role models for the inmates.

For these reasons and also as a recruitment device to attract more trained people to the correctional field, the program is expanding its use of college students. For the experimental vocational project, a cooperative program has been developed to enlist the aid of college students, particularly those majoring in education and counseling, to help the professional staff in the areas of remediation, testing, job placement, guidance and counseling. There is also a proposal to use college students to administer an extension program to enable inmates who have not enrolled in the school to receive "academic, prevocational, and rehabilitative training," while continuing with their regular work-detail assignments.

There is no expansion of the Service Corps planned, however. The chief value of the Service Corps, one staff member observed, is that it provides an opportunity for inmates to be trained to assume responsibility. "When you get down to it, they have always had something either done for them, to them, or against them." They need to learn how to internalize controls, he felt.

Unfortunately, however, they cannot always do this. When the self-instructional school was first established, for example, there was no College Corps, and there were incidents where some Service Corpsmen had to be relieved of their assignment because they stole examinations or marked answers "correct" that were incorrect. A staff member reported: "Their loyalty was to their friends and to the inmate culture more than to their position as unofficial members of the project staff."

---

[28] David S. Bushnell, "Literacy Training of Prison Inmates," *Experiment in Culture Expansion, op. cit.*, pp. 101–106.

Now, through more careful selection and training, frequent meetings with the professional staff, and close supervision by the College Corps, staff feel they have adequate controls to keep the Service Corps functioning effectively. Turnover has been very small, and the fact that the corpsmen are now being paid ($2.00 a week) has given them an additional incentive to match up to staff's expectations.

When trust is assured, staff members believe, there can be special advantages in using inmates. For example, one inmate has been assigned to work with the director of the educational program, the warden (a sociologist), and a special research consultant on a study of the characteristics of the inmates at Draper. This inmate is helping to design the questionnaire and will do the interviewing. His associate staff feel that, because of his knowledge of the inmate culture and his ability to gain the confidence of and communicate with the men, he is making a significant contribution. On the other hand, they observe that he is an exceptional inmate. He has not had a criminal career, has had some college training, plans to continue with his college education, and has been closely associated with program staff. While other inmates may also have the competence, they would be likely to distort the information because they would not identify with the goals of the project.

Because of this loyalty issue, but at the same time wishing to capitalize on the advantages of using offenders, Draper is now proposing to involve its PACE students in its program. They would be used in research to follow up former prisoners and in education to supervise the progress of former Draper students who are continuing their programed instruction in the community. It is expected that this part-time work would give them some financial help, contribute to the rehabilitation of other parolees, and, in the process of helping others, reinforce their own identification with positive goals.

The dilemma Draper faces in the use of inmates in education is the same dilemma faced by any of the other institutions that are attempting to create new roles for inmates. Whether the interest is in involving them in treatment, research, or education, the problem is one of balancing increased responsibility on the one hand with assuring adequate control on the other. If participation in the rehabilitative process can contribute to the inmates' rehabilitation, then opportunity to assume responsibility should be afforded them, regardless of whether their first loyalties are to the inmate culture. By doing so, however, the institution faces the risk of having its program subverted.

In attempting to restructure institutions into the model of therapeutic communities, correctional innovators are hoping to break up the inmate culture and the "we-they" atmosphere that prevails. Yet they and others recognize that the very nature of institutions poses enormous obstacles to developing a sense of community. This is one of the reasons the current trend in corrections is to seek out alternatives to institutionalization. The move now is to place greater reliance on probation, on early release and aftercare, and to develop new forms of community treatment. Part II of this report discusses the implications of this trend in terms of manpower needs and the creation of new roles for nonprofessionals.

Part II

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES IN THE COMMUNITY

Chapter 3 PROBATION AND PAROLE

Introduction

Probation and parole work provides a contrast with correctional institutions. The emphasis in the latter has been to upgrade the qualifications of undereducated and untrained personnel. The manpower problem in probation and parole, on the other hand, is generally viewed as a need to raise the level of professionalism, probably because these are newer services established with a casework orientation.

Both probation and parole are essentially 20th century developments, with the major growth in recent decades. In 1900, probation laws existed in only six States. Today there is a law in every State as well as at the Federal level, but as recently as 1953, some States had no legal provisions for either function.[1]

Total combined employment of Federal, State, and local probation and parole officers numbered 13,072 in 1962. The recent growth in employment is indicated by the increase, for example, in the number of probation officers in the State of New Jersey—from 270 in 1960–61 to 397 three years later.[2]

Because of this recent development, it is not surprising that probation and parole suffer from a lack of uniformity in staffing policies and procedures, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Of the total number of probation and parole officers in the United States, 4,000, or almost one-third, are employed in New York and California, while 24 States employ fewer than 100 officers in either State or local jurisdictions. In four States, county welfare workers also serve in the capacity of probation or parole agents,[3] and in some counties, the staff is almost exclusively volunteer.[4]

---

[1] University of Louisville, Kentucky, *Proceedings: Fourth Annual Institute on Probation and Parole Supervision*, 1963, p. 1.

[2] F. Lovell Bixby, "New Jersey Consultative System for Improved Probation Services," *State Government*, 38 (Spring 1963), pp. 96–99.

[3] Statistical information is taken from the *Probation and Parole Directory*, New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1963.

[4] For example, the Royal Oak, Michigan, Municipal Court Probation Service is staffed by 500 volunteer counselors (lawyers, teachers, ministers, social workers, psychiatrists), supervised by 8 paid officers.

State requirements and actual hiring criteria vary. Some agencies are staffed entirely by those with graduate degrees in social work, law, criminology, or psychology. Others have only recently made a college degree mandatory for new appointees. No uniformity prevails. In the Federal service, where standards are generally higher, the Judicial Conference recommended in 1942 that new appointees have a bachelor's degree or its equivalent and two years of relevant experience or training either in a recognized school of social service or in a university. Although judges of the District Court are free to determine what constitutes a "suitable person" within the meaning of the statutes, they have been bound since 1964 by minimum requirements for appointment, set in 1961 by the Judicial Conference. There are still some officers in the Federal service who do not meet these minimum requirements, but most of them have been in the service since before the requirements were established.

The Dispute Over Professionalism

The Social Work Model

Notwithstanding this diversity of standards, those engaged in probation and parole are commonly referred to as "professionals" by practitioners and outside experts. The definition of a professional, however, remains an unsettled question. Directors of Federal, State, and local services, together with spokesmen in academic circles and professional associations, recognize that neither probation nor parole is a profession *per se* and is unlikely to become so. They are also aware that the work itself embraces multidisciplinary approaches of law and the behavioral sciences. "Probation is an essentially modern method for the treatment of offenders, and as such is rooted in the broader social and cultural trends of the modern era."[5]

Yet many agree that the most appropriate training for probation and parole officers is social work. Although probation is in part defined by legal requirements and by the necessity to protect the community, it is the adjustment of the individual that is seen as the heart of the service. Officers, it is said, require skills in interviewing and counseling and understanding of psychological factors developed in social-work training. In the view of department heads of services largely staffed by social workers, not only is the training appropriate, but the degree furnishes the officer with both the status and skill necessary to deal with courts, social agencies, schools, and other institutions. In this view, not only does the client require the services of this profession, but, because the nature of the work brings the officer into frequent contact with other professionals, it is important that he meet them on an equal footing. "Social workers are able to conduct far more incisive presentence investigations because of their understanding of motivation and other behavioral aspects." While these were the words of one department head interviewed in this study, they typify the viewpoint of those who advocate social-work training.

---

[5] Barbara A. Kay and Clyde B. Vedder, *Probation and Parole*, Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas Co., 1963.

Other practitioners question this point of view. Some feel that other approaches have potential. As one training expert said: "I would never buy the idea that all probation officers should be social workers, although I am one myself." Recent studies have given some support to this position. They suggest that the social worker may be limited by his training. A study in progress at the Federal District Court in San Francisco, for example, reports that social workers more frequently recommend institutionalization than officers with other kinds of training (such as criminology) or those without professional education.

The social-work approach, some experts feel, engenders an attitude of caution or even of pessimism toward those who manifest serious maladjustment or unstable work or family history. The social worker, by recommending commitment limits his clientele to those for whom casework (in social-work terms) appears to offer hope for success. For this reason, it has been suggested that the work of the Master of Social Work cannot be reliably compared with that of officers who are not Masters of Social Work. Superior performance by social workers may be attributable to the tendency to "cream" cases and concentrate on good risks. In one agency, for example, it was reported that nonprofessional probation officers—college graduates without additional graduate training—performed better with cases adjudged "hopeless" than social workers did.[6]

The prevalent desire to limit institutionalization and extend the application of community treatment by placing more cases on probation, or offering parole to the offender at the earliest possible date, suggests that the social-work model requires reevaluation. Trends in the development of corrections and the evolution of a social philosophy may require different training. If negotiations with the community become a more important function, as seems indicated, officers will need new skills. This, of course, also may be the direction in which social work will move. In the words of an eminent authority in the field of criminology: "Today a good social worker should be joining movements rather than working as a correctional officer." Social change, rather than adjustment to the society, may become the overriding goal. But such developments are likely to occur only in the long run. In the short run, the growing interest in developing a greater range of services may shift the emphasis away from a casework orientation or at least cause rethinking of training requirements.

---

[6] Milford B. Lytle, "The Unpromising Client," *Crime and Delinquency*, 10 (April 1964), p. 134.

Problems in Attracting Professionals

Despite such formulations, casework remains the fundamental method accepted by most practitioners in probation and parole, and social work is currently the only source of trained caseworkers. It is not surprising, therefore, that a principal concern of those in the field is the inability to attract sufficient numbers of social workers to corrections.

In addition to the recruitment problems attributable to the national shortage of social workers, special problems make it difficult for probation and parole services to compete effectively for trained personnel. For some time, social-work educators and other experts have been concerned with the conflict between the authoritarian setting of work with offenders and the client-centered approach of social work. For some, this problem is peculiar to corrections and is a principal reason for the low esteem in which these occupations are held by the social-work profession. Others have pointed out that the same strains between authority and the protective function of the caseworker exist in other social-work fields, such as welfare and mental health work.[7]

In professional circles, the issue is unresolved, but it appears that practitioners generally agree that "error lies in the assumption that authority is necessarily hostile. Authority is not hostile, only those who abuse it." Some indicated that social workers in corrections may indeed enjoy more latitude than their counterparts in other fields. "The courts and police tend to rely on the social worker's judgment and rarely hand down strict mandates."

Most probably would agree with the comment made by one practitioner that "the ideological issue is a 'straw man.'" The real issue, as they see it, is a practical one: the lack of professionalism and the poor working conditions that inhibit professional development.

Most will concede that a major problem is the lack of an adequate salary scale. The greater attraction of the Federal service, where salaries are higher, frequently is cited as evidence.[8] Some have proposed that holders of master's degrees be compensated at a higher rate, but are aware that this would meet with resistance from parole and probation organizations who, as one practitioner observed, "tend to go to bat for anyone who fills the job."

---

[7] For a discussion of this conflict, see Lloyd E. Ohlin, Herman Piven, and Donnel M. Pappenfort, "Major Dilemmas of Social Workers in Probation and Parole," *NPPA Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (July 1956), pp. 211–225; Elliot Studt, "Worker-Client Authority Relationships in Social Work," *Social Work*, 4 (January 1959), p. 18; and David G. French, *Needed Research on Social Work Manpower*, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of Family Services, 1964.

Most chiefs report that their offices are understaffed, qualitatively if not in actual numbers. Unfilled jobs and high turnover characterize their departments. Offices in many large urban centers are further burdened by inadequate clerical personnel. With probation and parole officers forced to perform routine clerical tasks, professionalism is downgraded.

Because of understaffing, most departments feel their officers must handle excessive caseloads. The standard caseload of 50 was established as early as 1915 by the National Probation and Parole Association, at a time when the type of case, the nature of the practice, and even such fundamental conditions as the number of working hours were vastly different. Nevertheless, this standard, or some reasonable approximation, remains as the yardstick, even though it has almost never been met. Even in the Federal service, district offices report that average caseloads are 50 percent and more above the standard. In major urban centers, the caseload average is frequently double the standard.

Apart from contradictory research findings and conflicting opinions as to size of caseload, which will be discussed later in this chapter, professionals are understandably repelled by too large a caseload, and, consequently, recruiting among M.S.W.'s for work in probation and parole has been made even more difficult than can be accounted for by considerations of esteem and pay.

Upgrading the Professional

Despite the controversy between those who advocate departments staffed exclusively by professionals (who are the majority) and those who see a place for nonprofessionals, both agree that there is a need for attracting and developing better trained professionals. Both also agree that the social-work approach is the proper one. The problem, then, has become the expansion of the available supply of professional social workers, and a number of steps are being taken toward this end.

The Social-Work Curriculum. For some years, there has been interest in revising the social-work curriculum, not only with respect to probation and parole, but to the entire field of corrections.

---

[8] The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1960 estimated the median salary for State and local probation and parole officers at $5,930 per annum, compared with $6,600 for Federal officers and $7,000 for social workers.

Since 1955, the Council on Social Work Education has been conducting studies on social-work resources, and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency has set up a special project to review the possibilities of better adaptation of the social-work curriculum to the field of corrections. On the local level, some probation and parole departments are working jointly with schools of social work to explore curriculum changes. For example, the Nassau County Probation Department and the Adelphi University School of Social Work in New York are experimenting with a curriculum for new probation officers that trains them in group work and community organization as well as in casework. They are taking courses while receiving inservice training.

Many schools of social work are resisting such modifications. Even some who feel that social-work training needs revision question whether specific adaptations should be made for correctional work. They see social work as a generic form of training whose practices and concepts apply to the broad social-welfare field. If specific adaptations are being made for corrections, they feel, it is largely because social-work schools cannot resist the pressures of correctional agencies, which are sending more of their people for training, and, consequently, supplying a larger share of the budget. But on theoretical grounds they see no more justification for addressing social work to corrections than to any other field.

New Curricula. Because of the resistance of social-work schools and because of the conviction that social work is not the only appropriate training, experimentation is occurring with other types of curricula. For example, the University of Minnesota's Department of Sociology is developing a one-year master's degree program in corrections. The foundation of the program comes from social work, particularly in methods and in concepts of growth and development. The courses are taken largely from those already offered at the University, but there is a plan for future development of a special sequence. At present, the program consists of courses from the fields of law, public administration, psychology, counseling, and social work, coupled with a special seminar on experiences in the placement of offenders.

The State's corrections association has been instrumental in developing this program, believing this could be one major answer to its professional manpower needs. The University's social-work school has not been turning out sufficient numbers of caseworkers; moreover, its training does not equip them for administrative work. Through this new program, the corrections association believes that it will be able to recruit more professionals, better trained for work in the field, whether as probation and parole officers or as caseworkers and administrators in correctional institutions. Whether probation and parole agencies in the State will support this program is another question, especially since some of the major agencies are moving in the direction of requiring an M.S.W. degree.

Interest is also being expressed by some educators in creating undergraduate programs as preparation for direct entry into the social services, including corrections, on a professional basis. Some faculty members from the School of Social Work at San Diego State College, for example, would like to see an undergraduate program developed which would prepare the student, upon completion, for immediate employment. College graduates so trained, it is felt, could make a contribution without further education and could explore the career opportunities in corrections by working, possibly returning later for graduate training.

Inservice Training. Probation and parole departments on their own are also experimenting with curriculum. While most follow the pattern of the Federal Probation Training Center in providing orientation and refresher courses, some are using inservice training as their major vehicle for developing new officers, substituting their own program for graduate training.

In New York City, for example, the probation department offers a full-time, two-year course with 21 college-level points in the social sciences for college graduates who have passed State aptitude tests required for all those in governmental careers. Trainees are paid at the rate of $5,450 per annum, which compares with a $6,290 starting level for full-fledged officers. The course is partly formal classroom instruction and partly rotating fieldwork assignment. Although developed as a practical measure because of the difficulty of recruiting social workers, those in charge of the program prefer this method to hiring already trained social workers. They believe their probation officers need social-work training combined with the specifics of probation. They are also finding that their training program is attracting new recruits who, on the whole, seem to be superior to those whom they have hired before. Moreover, since trainees have no tenure, they can be dropped at any time, insuring a qualitative selectivity.

The success of this program is in part attributed to the professional competence of the executive leadership, which is aware of the need to draw on new ideas from other disciplines. In many other agencies, supervisors and administrators are old-line officers, and inservice training consists almost exclusively of detailing traditional practices and procedures. Little attention is paid to the concepts of social work, psychology, or criminology. For example, in a study of training programs of 14 large police and probation departments across the country, undertaken by the School of Criminology at the University of California, it was found that "little attempt was made to explain policy or make explicit why certain procedures had grown up. . . . Formal materials were frequently out of date and at odds with current academic theory. . . . Perhaps the most glaring inadequacy in the training materials surveyed was the lack of any statement of the accumulated wisdom garnered by knowledgeable people working in specific departments." [9]

Because of the generally low level of supervisory staff reflected in the quality of inservice training, the aid of universities and outside organizations has been enlisted. Within the Federal Government, the Children's Bureau and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development have played an especially significant role in establishing workshops, institutes, and training centers to upgrade personnel in the broader correctional field. Although departments have frequently resisted such outside interference, through negotiation and on-the-spot instruction of supervisors, it has been possible to break down resistance in many cases. Reports of training activities by these outside groups suggest that they do change staff attitudes, encourage innovation, and improve relations with other community agencies.[10]

Increasingly, departments are providing stipends for officers to continue their education, particularly in social work. Some departments limit financial assistance to those eligible for supervisory posts, while others systematically send a number of staff each year and are creating the imminent prospect of a completely professional staff. Schools of social work have sometimes resisted this development, feeling they are being pressured to accept students whom they would otherwise reject. Nevertheless, this practice is becoming a trend in the field.

Recruitment. Concurrently with the stress on upgrading has come a stepping-up of recruitment activities. State and national correctional agencies, as well as such regional groups as the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, have been actively encouraging the development of greater numbers of field placements and summer internships for social-work students in corrections. In addition, cooperative work-study schemes are being proposed. Interest has reached downward to the undergraduate level, with probation and parole departments participating in summer internship programs and other activities designed to attract college students to the general social-welfare field. The Brooklyn Probation Department, for example, is conducting a course which it initiated and organized for undergraduates attending colleges in the New York area to acquaint them with the nature of probation services. Intended as a stimulant to potential recruitment, it is offered to prospective social-work students as well as to those in public administration, psychology, and those who are not committed to any specific vocation.[11]

---

[9] These quoted comments on the findings of the study appeared in a typed proposal, dated July 27, 1964, submitted by the School of Criminology to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The proposal envisioned an enlarged investigation of "training opportunities in juvenile delinquency."

[10] See E. Paul Torrance, A. O. Prakash, Gargi Luthre, and Conchita Tan, "Evaluation of the Juvenile Court Judges Institute, the Juvenile Officers Institute, and the Principals Workshop on Problems of the Economically and Culturally Deprived Child," Center for Continuation Study, Extension Division, University of Minnesota, October 1964 (mimeographed).

Some departments, particularly those offering higher salaries, report good results from these activities. According to one expert interviewed, however, most departments do not retain the people they have recruited as interns or social-work students, except for those who are the least imaginative and the most security-conscious. Such problems have redoubled the interest of leadership in the field to improve the level of current staff.

Possibilities for Use of Nonprofessionals

While the major thrust has been on upgrading the "professional" probation and parole officer, some thought has been given to the possibilities for other types of staffing. Part of the stimulus for experimentation has come from the burden of large caseloads and the manifest impossibility of meeting recommended standards with available qualified personnel. Some practitioners argue that probation and parole functions do not require professional training, nor do all cases demand intensive service.

Much correctional research has been devoted to this subject, particularly to the development of offender typologies, in order to investigate the need for intensive service and to test the efficacy of varying sized caseloads with selected groups.[12] The results of such studies are not conclusive, but they suggest that reduction of caseloads alone does not necessarily increase effectiveness. Some workers report significant differences with reduced caseloads; others find that beyond a certain point there are diminishing returns, and that more intensive service has impact only on middle risk cases. In the San Francisco study already referred to (p. 63 *supra*), individuals assigned to fictitious officers seem to be performing as well as those receiving service. Reduced caseloads have little impact on good risk cases, possibly because this type of offender is unlikely to commit a second offense under any circumstances. One parole expert has noted that even in thinly populated counties where virtually no professional staff is available, and where all offenders receive only limited supervision, as many as 70 percent "make it."

---

[11] Joseph A. Shelly, "Bringing the Classroom into the Courtroom," *Crime and Delinquency* (January 1961), pp. 25–36.

[12] See, for example, the Los Angeles County Department's Research Report No. 10, "Probationer Characteristics and Probation Practice," and No. 12, "Interim Evaluation of the Intensive Supervision Case Load Project"; Michigan Crime and Delinquency Council, *Saginaw Probation Demonstration Report, 1963;* National Institute of Mental Health, "The San Francisco Project: A Study of Federal Probation and Parole," Research Report No. 1 April 1965; and studies conducted by the Special Intensive Parole Unit of the Research Division of the California Department of Corrections.

To some of the leaders in the field, the findings of recent studies are evidence of the growing complexity of providing probation and parole services and the need for more, rather than less, professionalism. Because of the increase in youthful offenders, the widening scope of family courts, and the higher incidence of special problems such as narcotic addiction, the work of many probation departments has broadened. Moreover, the growing reluctance to institutionalize offenders has resulted in a greater range and intensity of problems among probationers. As a result of the wider use of probation and of special institutions other than prisons, there are now fewer good risks among parolees. Thus, in both fields, routine supervision becomes a smaller part of the work, and counseling and casework skills need further development.

Furthermore, this argument runs, society has become more complex, particularly in urban settings, and intervention on behalf of the offender has become more difficult. Institutions have proliferated and are growing more specialized; it is more difficult to make connections for the offender. Negotiating the system requires high level skills, especially when so many agencies are involved. The job-development function of probation and parole, for example, has become more taxing because of the slack in the labor market and the decline of unskilled and blue-collar employment. Officers cannot simply refer probationers and parolees to unfilled openings, especially since as one observed, "they should view their task as providing them with a new lease on life." With education assuming greater importance in employability, officers should become actively engaged in opening doors for return to school, following the precedent set by some departments that have convinced colleges to accept parolees. Such collaboration with other agencies, they argue, takes skill in persuasion initially and then in discriminating among parolees to ensure appropriate placement.

Classification of Cases

From a practical standpoint, real casework is impossible in most existing departments. As one administrator commented: "With a caseload of over 100, you delude yourself if you think you are providing counseling." Time studies indicate that, in many communities, probation officers spend only a minor portion of their working time in direct client contact.[13] As one chief commented about his department: "Because of the number of offenders under supervision, all cases are given only routine attention. You simply jump from crisis to crisis."

Attempts are being made to use existing staff more effectively by realigning the caseload since manpower cannot be expanded sufficiently. Some offices have modified the traditional geographic basis of assignment by creating case specialization. In the New York City office of the State Division of Parole, for example, youth, the retarded, the gifted, and addicts are grouped into special, small caseloads. Advocates of this approach feel that officers are thus able to provide intensive service, and, as they develop their specialties, they can provide better service. In addition to the possibility of better service, this practice conserves staff skills.

Some practitioners oppose the development of specialization because they feel that only through contact with a variety of offenders can an officer develop skills and gain insight into behavior. Others have found it good administrative practice to ease the caseload burden by mixing good risks with those requiring more intensive supervision. In practice, however, redistribution of cases is common, if only to assign more difficult cases to the better officers. This kind of informal assignment may now be regularized in some departments, with lower educational requirements for officers dealing with the least difficult offenders.

In a few instances, this trend has resulted in the creation of a new staff position, the investigator. In the New York City Family Court, for example, a proposal is now under consideration to use investigators, considered a subprofessional category, for good risks, specifically for nonsupport cases. The rationale is that such cases rarely require more than routine processing of complaints in arrears. In these cases, probation officers rarely offer family or marital counseling, which has been the justification for professional assignments. For investigators, the qualifications will be a bachelor's degree without any experience or a high school diploma plus three years of experience in interviewing or investigating in a large industrial organization or government agency. Investigators would be able to handle almost all nonsupport work, selecting out those who require or desire counseling and referring them to professionals. The expectation is that practical service will be considerably improved and counseling will be more effective when limited to the small numbers referred.

---

[13] See, for example, Arthur B. Miles, *A Time Study of Wisconsin Probation and Parole Agents*, State Department of Public Welfare, Division of Corrections, March 1964; also A. Kenneth Pye, *et al.*, *A Preliminary Survey of the Federal Probation System*, Georgetown University Law Center, 1963, for data on the Federal probation service.

In a sense, this proposal is an attempt to sort out those cases in which a casework approach is not needed, but reclassification on this basis depends on the basic expectations and goals of probation and parole. Analysis of the reasons for criminal behavior and the attempt to provide therapeutic treatment require more than routine processing. But this issue, while of theoretical importance, has little bearing on the current situation in most jurisdictions where staff has neither the time nor the skill to engage in such treatment. Furthermore, parolees in particular may resent intensive supervision as a form of badgering or manipulation; many feel that they have served their time and should be subjected only to the minimal interference required by the law. In any case, it seems clear that, with or without theoretical justification, existing pressures will lead to more and more experimental use of manpower.

Job Redefinition

Quite apart from the attempt to establish case typologies for the purpose of officer assignment, some experiments in manpower utilization are based on a functional approach to the tasks involved in probation and parole. On one level, there has been consideration of using different kinds of personnel for investigation of cases and for supervision of probationers and parolees. Here, too, there is disagreement in the field as to the wisdom of separating these activities. Some practioners view them as integrally related, a relationship that must be maintained for full understanding of the case. Others, who feel that investigation and supervision might be separated, disagree as to which is more demanding.

At least in a theoretical sense, investigation may be the point at which professional skills are best used in the assessment of client problems and need and, since presentence investigation is the basis of judicial determination, it requires the casework skills. Practically, many departments are too burdened to perform this kind of careful analysis; investigation is generally confined to collection of objective data, and judicial action rests on such facts as employment history, marital status, and education, rather than on sensitive interpretation.[14] In the light of this pattern, supervision becomes the most important activity since it provides an opportunity to build rapport and to work for the rehabilitation of the client.

Whether investigation or supervision is considered more critical, there are functions relating to both that can be classified as routine and suitable for nonprofessionals, as well as some functions that might require limited training for positions roughly analogous to technicians. Again, the field is divided: some suggest that much of the paper work and, in fact, some of the data-gathering and verification required both in presentence investigation and in supervision could be handled by those without professional skills; others maintain that no function can be considered routine. In the latter view, most objective material requires professional assessment. In the words of one practitioner: "You would not call in a nonprofessional to remove a brain tumor simply because there was a shortage of neurosurgeons!"

Most of the actual manpower experiments and innovations have been related to investigation. Some of them have arisen simply out of good administrative practice. In many offices, for example, it has been standard procedure to expand the functions of clerks in order to make maximum use of existing staff. In one instance, clerks not only gather and compile the basic data but have also designed the appropriate form letters for this process. They have been trained to administer standard physical questionnaires and serve as escorts for clients referred to other agencies. In effect, they are working out of title, possibly because they had skills above civil service requirements. With clerical salaries in government no longer competitive, there is some doubt whether new employees will have the ability to carry on these additional functions.

In Nassau County, a case aide category was especially designed and put into effect in 1962 in the Family Court Probation Service. The yearly salary was established at approximately $4,000. Qualifications for these aides include completion of at least two years of college, the ability to type reasonably well, a pleasing telephone voice, and a sympathetic and tactful manner. No examinations have been used as yet. Applicants are screened entirely by interview. Aides are not trained in special programs but are included in the first session of the orientation conducted for all new probation officers. They function as a "strong right hand" for the professional. Some are stationed at the reception desk, where they greet clients and answer inquiries as to the appropriateness of the jurisdiction. If, for example, because of the nature of the problem or the residence of the client, another court has jurisdiction, they will direct the client and help him complete the necessary referral forms. Intake functions are limited to these nonsensitive questions, but the aide must be sufficiently tactful to deal with upset or even distraught clients. Aides also answer all telephone calls and take messages for the professionals.

---

[14] See, for example, the Annual Report for 1961 of the Wayne County, Michigan, Probation Department, which details the facts on which the probation officer recommends probation or institutionalization for offenders.

The job of case aide is seen by staff as a permanent career level. It has particular appeal, they think, to the mature housewife who has two or three years of college and does not wish to continue her education but would rather find a position for which she is already qualified. Some aides are younger women who may find this a stimulus to return to college and aim for a professional career in probation. No provision has been made to promote those in clerical jobs, however, to aide levels or to upgrade the aides themselves. The aide program is unique, at least in New York State, and is considered a successful innovation. Those hired are performing well, and there has been little turnover.

Apart from specially designed aide positions, new staffing patterns are suggested by other manpower experiments. The college intern program of the Federal District Court of Chicago was initiated as a recruiting device to attract college graduates to the social-welfare field, but aspects of this program may serve as a model for a new job category. Four or five college juniors are selected to participate on the basis of their articulateness, intelligence, and personality. They are expected to be sufficiently mature to meet people and present a favorable image of the agency, since they are sworn in as volunteer probation officers and are considered agency representatives. They are paid $50 a week (for eight weeks) out of a foundation grant.

For the first two weeks, the interns participate in an intensive reading and discussion program under the guidance of a probation officer. Subsequently, they begin to participate in the investigation process, first by picking up forms at the precinct station (so-called "police clearances"), then progressing to interviews with police officers and the clearance of other routine information. At the next stage, the interns are assigned to do investigations for other Federal courts involving offenders who had previously lived in the Chicago area. This process involves checking school, police, and employment records, together with some interviewing. This work is performed under supervision, and the reports are edited by the supervisor as part of the training process.

In practice, the professionals in this agency find that time limitations restrict them to interviewing clients and their families and that other information has to be picked up by routine mailings. The experience of the interns seems to indicate that the addition of nonprofessional staff might actually enhance the quality of the information gathered. To train nonprofessional investigators would require more intensive practice in techniques of information-gathering than is necessary for the interns, but the fact that an orientation program of this type has resulted in the addition of a useful resource implies that permanent positions are feasible if appropriate training is available.

The intern program has implications for case supervision as well as for investigation. The eight-week training period is too short to permit students to handle cases. Toward the end of the period, however, they are permitted to interview individuals about to complete their probationary period and, in some cases, they write up the "closing" report. In fact, there are a number of functions that can be separated out of case supervision, particularly with respect to referral. Parolees, for example, may need housing, jobs, health care, or welfare services. Putting them in touch with the appropriate agency is a time-consuming task that might well be assigned to a nonprofessional. Probation officers often try to shunt this kind of job to graduate students doing field work in the agency, a practice opposed by the administration as inimical to professional development.

It is clear that, within both investigation and supervision, there are a number of functions that can be parcelled out as the province of nonprofessional personnel who could be trained to carry out routine activities that now either overburden staff or are not adequately performed.

Another type of new manpower utilization arises when wholly new activities are introduced. It has been suggested, for example, that routine screening of misdemeanant cases might indicate which individuals need service to obviate the commission of a second and more serious offense. Already, the establishment of release on recognizance, initiated in New York City in 1964, has resulted in a new job title for investigators. The qualifications are set by civil service—a high school diploma, plus three years of investigatory experience, or a bachelor's degree without experience. To permit use of nonprofessionals, the work was carefully structured. A questionnaire is completed by the investigator in a direct interview with the arraignee and then verified through outside sources by telephone. Questions are limited to factual material relating to school record, employment, residence, marital status, etc. The questionnaire is designed to record stability factors and is complemented by a weighting scale which automatically evaluates the data. The findings are presented to the judge as the basis for release without bail. The entire process is one which involves only limited interpretation by staff.

In addition to the permanent investigator, law student aides work part-time or full-time at identical tasks with tenure limited to one year. For permanent hires, the job can serve as a promotional opportunity to a senior line, but not all seniors will develop through promotion. They may be hired directly from the outside if they possess somewhat higher qualifications—a high school diploma plus five years of experience, or a bachelor's degree plus one year of experience. The same holds true for the supervisory level of investigation, with a still higher entry requirement for experience.

It is noteworthy that those already hired have been exclusively recent college graduates. This may have resulted from better test performance, but it is possible that few high school graduates have three years of relevant experience. To recruit noncollege graduates would require lowering of the experience criterion.

The program is thus far adjudged a success and, because of judicial intent to extend this service to all arraignments, the program will be extended. "Failures"—those who do not appear when called to court—run at approximately 1 to 2 percent. As a byproduct, this new function has stimulated rethinking of the investigatory aspects of regular probation activities. It has been suggested that part of presentence investigation might be similarly structured and that an investigator could be given additional training to develop sensitivity to the implications of the information gathered.

At present, there is no career connection between investigators and probation officers. Experience as an investigator in the probation department is not considered fulfillment of the experience prerequisite for the next job category. This situation forecloses a potential source of recruitment.

Barriers to Manpower Innovations

The most promising avenue for utilizing new types of manpower in probation and parole is the redesign of positions to allocate routine functions to personnel with less education and experience than are now considered essential. Yet the number of actual innovations is small, probably because of the inability or unwillingness of agencies to overcome existing barriers to experimentation.

So-called "professional resistance" is actually of two types—that of the long-time jobholder who, whatever his academic credentials, considers any downward revision of hiring criteria a threat to his status and that of the Master of Social Work who feels that every function performed with or on behalf of the client is so significant that none can be designated as "routine." Where either of these feelings is strong, it is obviously difficult to tamper with the design of existing positions.

Even where there is interest in manpower experimentation, innovation may be precluded by the very shortage of personnel at all levels. Under the pressure of enormous caseloads, there is little time to examine current practice or to supervise and train less experienced personnel on the job. Not only are professionals in short supply but, in many agencies, understaffing in the clerical area is so acute that professionals, far from being able to turn over routine functions to clerks, must type their own reports. The problem of appropriate manpower utilization has to be addressed in the light of the occupational structure as well as in terms of specific job functions.

The discontinuity between occupational levels in probation and parole constitutes a serious barrier to manpower experiments. The gap between clerical and "professional" occupations is seldom bridged, since the differences in education and experience requirements are insurmountable obstacles for most employees. It is significant that, in the few instance where new positions have been introduced (namely, investigators and case aides), there has been no provision for continuity with either lower- or higher-rated occupations. Promotional opportunities are thus restricted to one narrow segment of the occupational structure, a factor that may serve to intensify shortages of manpower at all levels.[15]

The problem of continuity is closely connected with provisions for training and with hiring criteria themselves. As one administrator commented, "In order to make clerical occupations a stepping stone toward professional service, recruitment methods would require revision. Initial requirements might have to be lowered, training would have to be increased, and an intermediate level established." Some experts have pointed out that the introduction of training for those without professional accreditation would have to be accompanied by training for middle management and supervisors, since opportunities for upgrading would also have to be provided for the agency's professionals.

The precise tasks capable of successful performance by new types of staffing, in the view of some, "can only be ascertained through trial and error." Such experimentation is difficult "in a society which accepts credentials based on education as *prima facie* evidence of suitable capacity." Even in the few new positions created in probation and parole, the chief hiring criterion generally has been college attendance, if not an earned degree. While housewives with such credentials may thus be lured back into the labor market, it is questionable whether young men with college degrees would be attracted to "subprofessional" positions when promotion possibilities are limited or absent altogether.

---

[15] For examples of similar structural barriers to personnel development in industry, see National Committee on the Employment of Youth, *Getting Hired, Getting Trained*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965, Chap. 4.

Requiring experience also restricts the introduction of new types of staff whose personal attributes and desires to work in human services may, in fact, be more relevant than technical expertise.

Many civil service regulations not only specify salary scales and criteria for hiring and promotion but also may be designed to cover personnel in a variety of fields having little relevance for corrections. Where civil service provides few positions at the middle level, it is difficult for administrators to utilize staff in accordance with individual capability. Having employees work out of title may draw complaints from employees themselves or from government examiners.

Civil service regulations are difficult to modify, even when their anachronisms impede recruitment. For example, one probation department with a budget allotment for an interpreter is unable to recruit one because the civil service requirement calls for ability to speak, read, and write both Italian and Spanish in addition to English. Fluency in Italian is no longer needed in the community, but it is difficult to fill the job although the community abounds with persons fluent in English and Spanish. As a result, the department has had to fall back on what it considers the undesirable practice of using clients to act as interpreters for each other.

Chapter 4 NEW FORMS OF COMMUNITY TREATMENT

Introduction

The increase in demand for probation and parole services is but one indication of the trend in corrections to make less use of institutional commitment as a method of treating the offender. The reasons for this trend are both theoretical and practical.

Virtually all correctional experts agree that institutions obstruct rehabilitation. The environment restricts offenders to association with fellow offenders and thereby reinforces antisocial values, attitudes, and behavior. Homosexual practices are encouraged by the lack of normal sexual outlets. The atmosphere generates a criminal culture in opposition to authority.

While therapeutic communities may break up the criminal structure, they cannot offset all the negative effects of confining a group of men or women in an isolated setting. Nor can they obviate what is perhaps the major problem—adjustment to the community upon release. Very few offenders are "lifers." Most are incarcerated for only a short period of time, but commitment breaks their ties to the community.

One expert observed in an interview that in no case could he report any significant difference in parole outcome as a result of recent experiments in institutional treatment. The problems the offender leaves behind him are still there and, in fact, may be aggravated when he returns. An improved attitude toward authority or even a better understanding of himself may not be enough for him to cope in the community. Experts are beginning to question whether work camps, for example, represent any real advance in correctional practice. How much does hard, physical work in a rural setting prepare a youth for life in the city?

The community can offer a much broader range of service than is ordinarily available in an institution. Even those services considered essential to rehabilitation are rarely available in kind or number. It is difficult to attract competent psychiatrists, caseworkers, or teachers for work in institutions, especially if it means moving from the city to a rural community. Furthermore, legislatures, concerned about budgets, would resist any proposal greatly increasing the already high costs of institutionalization.

In fact, it is this issue of cost that is probably proving the strongest argument to convince legislatures of the need to treat the offender in the community, regardless of local opposition. One expert has estimated that while it "... costs upwards to $20,000 per man-unit to build a maximum security institution, ... probation and parole supervision costs, even at the recommended lower caseload levels, do not amount to more than several hundred dollars yearly per offender." [1] Community treatment also affords other financial savings, such as reduced public assistance payments, by allowing offenders to remain employed and support their families.

For all these reasons, the trend in corrections is to deemphasize institutionalizing the offender and to put greater stress on community services. New York and California, for example, are experimenting with short-term intensive treatment institutions. A current project of the California Youth Authority is combining this intensive treatment of the offender with group counseling for parents. Weekend furloughs provide the project with another link between the institution and the home environment.[2]

This California project is but one of the experiments under way to ease the offender's transition into the community. In addition to the efforts of parole departments to extend intervention in behalf of their cases, new forms of service are beginning to appear. Parole camps or institutional centers are being set up to provide prerelease guidance for the offender. Halfway houses are appearing in communities where, in a group-living situation, offenders are being given short-term support until they are ready to move out on their own. Aftercare services are also being made available to offenders who are no longer on parole—and over whom there is no legal control—to give them help in finding a job or a place to live.

Experiments with improved community services are indicating that more offenders can be treated in the community. There are many offenders who are not so dangerous as to require imprisonment, but judges feel they need supervision to effect their rehabilation. By adding more and better trained probation officers, the Saginaw, Michigan, project found, for example, that imprisonment was reduced from 36.6 percent to 19.3 percent.[3] California's Community Treatment Project, which is experimenting with a typology of treatment to match the typology of offender, found that 95 percent of the girls and 70 percent of the boys remanded to the Youth Authority for institutional commitment were declared by the judge to be eligible for the project.[4]

---

[1] Robert D. Vinter, "The Michigan Department of Corrections," 1961, p. 33 (mimeographed)—a chapter prepared for inclusion in a forthcoming volume on Michigan State Government.

[2] For a brief description of this project, see Department of the Youth Authority, *Status of Current Research in the California Youth Authority, op. cit.*, pp. 6–7.

A major reason so many offenders are institutionalized is the lack of a stable job and home situation. For delinquents, the usual recourse is foster home placement. But apart from the facts that there are not enough foster homes and arranging for suitable placement is a time-consuming process, correctional agencies are also questioning whether the foster home is an effective means of providing residential care, particularly for the adolescent. "Placement" cases pose problems among adult offenders as well. The Michigan Corrections Commission, in establishing a special project to deal with them, found, for example, that some men have lingered in prison 25 months beyond their release date, because they had no adequate home situation or job prospects.

States and communities are becoming aware that, if fewer offenders are to be institutionalized, the community must provide new and better services for them. To encourage communities to improve probation, California, for example, is proposing legislation whereby the savings in State funds resulting from fewer institutional commitments will be ploughed back into the improvement of probation services.[5]

Greater emphasis on probation is leading to experimentation with new methods of treating the offender. Following the lead of correctional institutions, probation departments are beginning to develop a variety of group activities, from counseling to weekend camping programs. Some are also establishing youth employment programs.

California's Community Treatment Project is using a clubhouse center as its vehicle for experimenting with different types of services. The State is now proposing the development of community centers, providing a halfway house for former inmates, an outpatient clinic for probationers and parolees, as well as a group residence for those who need this kind of controlled living experience. They would also serve as diagnostic centers for youth referred to the court. Minnesota is also considering this community-center approach, and, in a number of States and cities, a variety of nonresidential centers, boarding homes, and group residences are being developed. In some places, these are being incorporated into the community's total welfare program, open to anyone who needs them.

---

[3] Jack I. Green, "Saving People and Money, A Pioneer Michigan Experiment in Probation—'The Saginaw Project,'" Michigan: Michigan Crime and Delinquency Council, January 1963, p. 1.

[4] State of California, Youth and Adult Corrections Agency, "CTP Research Report No. 5," February 1964.

[5] For description of the intent and nature of pending State Senate Bill 822, see California Board of Corrections, *Probation Supervision and Training*, California: Office of State Printing, 1964.

This experimentation with new forms of community treatment has in turn stimulated experimentation with manpower. Many of these centers and group residences are patterned after the more advanced institutional models and duplicate their experimentation with manpower. But expansion of their services involves other community agencies. Antipoverty programs particularly are stimulating new community activities, and their mandate to involve the poor has fostered the creation of roles for nonprofessionals. Experimentation of one kind tends to generate further experimentation. By introducing change into the system—in this case, new types of service—changes in the uses of manpower naturally follow.

New Roles for Nonprofessionals

In new community services for offenders, nonprofessionals are being used: to supervise the residential care of offenders in the community; to assist in group-counseling programs and in a variety of group-work activities; and to serve in an "outreach" capacity, providing follow-up support to offenders released from institutions, assisting in research activities and explaining the program to the community. Examination of the experience of some of these newer programs will reveal the issues emerging in creating jobs for nonprofessionals in correctional services in the community.

Residential Supervision

The common pattern emerging for residential services for offenders in the community is the small group residence in an urban neighborhood, operated by nonprofessionals with backgrounds similar to those of the offenders.

The New York State Division for Youth, for example, is experimenting with converting apartments in urban renewal areas for use as group residences, staffed by married couples to be selected on the basis of their ability to relate to youth. The United Planning Organization, the antipoverty program in Washington, D.C., is developing group homes in a slum neighborhood, staffed largely by neighborhood residents. And correctional agencies in such States as Oregon, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are exploring the possibilities of group homes for older delinquents, preferably run by ex-offenders or others who could be classified as "indigenous leaders." This approach assumes that some young offenders need informal supervision in a natural setting, not from parental figures, but rather on the model of an aunt and uncle. This kind of easy relationship, it is felt, cannot be so readily developed by professionals who tend to define the offender as a social-work client. Nor can it be developed in a foster home where "parents" become too involved in the life of a youth who yearns for independence. In a foster home, a young person may feel outnumbered by the adults, but in the group residence he has the support of his peers.

This line of thought is supported by the experience of the Michigan Corrections Commission which, in 1960, undertook a special project to provide residential facilities for parolees and probationers in Grand Rapids. Originally the intention was to place these offenders with middle class families, recruiting them through local churches and civic groups. Experience proved, however, that the foster home was both ineffective and impractical. Although the parole officer made some 45 speeches before various groups, few families were willing to participate—and those who did were unsatisfactory.

> As might be expected, the men resented close, intense concern with their welfare, which resembled a parent-child relationship; the families found it difficult to reach these psychologically impoverished men and applied standards of behavior in etiquette that were foreign to them. . . . There was also a preoccupation on the part of the families in the program, with a danger of violations committed by the residents which would involve the home.[6]

With no other apparent alternative, the parole officer decided to canvass boarding house operators and was able to obtain sufficient placements in this way. Although this arrangement developed out of practical necessity, it was more effective. Close personal ties developed between the offenders and their landlords.

> Frequently, the landlords 'lent' or gave them clothing, loaned them money, gave them odd jobs around the place, helped them find jobs, counseled them on their problems, albeit in an offhand, perhaps joking . . . manner. The men, in return, frequently did odd jobs without pay; indicated that they respected their landlords and valued their opinions; paid the going rate for room and board, rather than the reduced rate, as soon as they could afford it, and on their own initiative;

---

[6] Charles Perrow, *The Resident Home Program*, prepared for the Michigan Department of Corrections and the McGregor Fund of Detroit, July 1963, p. 8. The quotations that follow come from pp. 10–12.

> and frequently visited after they moved away to an apartment of their own.

The researcher who evaluated the program feels that the contractual arrangement encouraged these ties by providing a structure within which young offenders could "establish a posture of independence and virility, while maintaining a covert dependency upon a few significant persons in their environment."

But the nature of the landlords themselves was considered to be another contributing factor. Originally, there were 30 with whom the parole officer placed the offenders, but he found only about half of them to be effective, and these he began using consistently. By and large, he found the most successful ones to be those who had had problems of their own, alcoholism, for example, or where they themselves or members of their families had had contact with the law. They offered advice only on request. On the other hand, the middle class types, whether boarding-house operators or foster parents, tended to become more emotionally involved in the lives of the offenders and superimposed their values on them.

The boarding-home arrangement also made it possible for the men to establish informal relations with fellow boarders and fellow offenders. It was found, for example, that

> . . . more men proved to have successful outcomes in those homes where there were other boarders than in those in which there were none, but even more important, this was especially true if there was another parolee or probationer in the home . . . . Offenders helped each other in finding jobs, meeting people, especially girls, and by showing each other around town.

While some minor incidents occurred, in no case was probation or parole violated as a result of direct contact with other offenders in the home.

As a result of this experience, the Michigan Corrections Commission has now established a resident home in the center-city area, operated by the couple who were the most successful boarding home operators. In the words of the parole officer: "The wife is the type of person who is warm, gives affection easily, and is willing to listen to people when they want to talk out their problems. The husband, on the other hand, is the type who can lay down the law, but neither one of them would be 'horrified' by the kinds of problems or behavior the offenders might display." Experience with the boarding-home situation has also convinced the parole officer of the value of using fellow offenders as role models, and he is planning to place a 64-year-old lifer about to be released on parole in the residence, because he believes he would be a stable influence on the younger men.

Not all agencies, however, share the conviction that group homes should be nonprofessional. One director of a halfway house, who himself is a professional, feels that supervision of offenders requires trained counselors because even the most informal contact may produce a discussion of the offenders' problems that demands professional insight. Some of the pioneering experiments have been under professional direction, partly to obviate adverse community reaction and partly because their therapeutic orientation demands specialized knowledge. But in the case of Daytop Lodge, a milieu-therapy residence for narcotic addicts operated by the Brooklyn Probation Department, the psychologist who originally directed it was replaced by a former addict, a high school graduate who had gone through Synanon. There may be more such examples in the future, as correctional institutions continue to experiment with this model, particularly since costs are thereby reduced.

The California Community Treatment Project suggests that there is need for a variety of residential facilities. For some offenders, boarding houses may be preferable to group homes. On the other hand, for others who need stronger controls and discipline, it may be necessary to establish "containment homes," and, in that case, it is felt experienced correctional officers would be required. This model already exists in some of the halfway houses established by correctional institutions, but then the issue arises whether they are not, in fact, more restrictive than ordinary parole. As one parolee observed: "Here I thought I was being released, but I find myself back in prison again."

Regardless of the variety, however, it seems that the prevailing model will be group homes run by local residents whose qualifications would be the same as the "good" cottage parent or the "good" foster parent—a warm personality and a liking for people. The one difference may be that they will be closer in background and experience to the offender himself.

Group Counseling

Group treatment, from counseling to therapy, is becoming a major element in virtually all residential facilities. In fact, group treatment is becoming a primary method of rehabilitating the offender, regardless of where he is housed. Increasingly, probation and parole departments are making use of group counseling as a substitute for individual casework or as a supplement. In addition, communities have been establishing special projects to test the adaptability of group treatment to nonresidential, urban settings.

By and large, these experiments with group treatment in the community have been going on under the direction of professionals trained to lead group sessions. But there are indications that the trend noted in correctional institutions of using lay group counselors and offenders as therapists is emerging in the community as well.

We have already observed that halfway houses established by correctional institutions tend to duplicate staffing patterns of the institutions. The prerelease guidance centers operated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons, for example, usually employ an experienced institutional administrator as director, with the treatment program supervised by a caseworker, assisted by correctional officers. This team approach, which stresses the counseling rather than custodial role of the correctional officer, is in accord with emerging policy in Federal institutions and is felt to be even more applicable to this situation, since the halfway house is intended to be less restrictive than the prison. The caseworker and the officers meet together regularly to discuss individual cases. While minor problems may be handled by the officers, they refer any case requiring more than routine attention to the social worker. Both, however, lead group-counseling sessions, the officers' usually having had prior experience in Federal institutions. They feel this arrangement of using the professional as the specialist as well as the supervisor and trainer of the nonprofessional works out well. Nor have they noted any problems in developing a good group atmosphere, whether the sessions are handled by the professional or the nonprofessional, so long as the group retains the same leader. The emergence of the nonprofessionally directed group residence, described above, offers another possible route of entry for the nonprofessional into group counseling. In most places where these residences are being established, the sponsoring agency assigns a professional to supervise and to provide both casework and group-counseling services. But the nonprofessionals offer informal counseling, and if they show an aptitude for leading group sessions, as they become more experienced they may assume a larger share of the counseling role.

This is the evolution that has been occurring in Grand Rapids. Originally, formal counseling was the sole responsibility of the parole officer in charge of the project, but the couple who operate the home, after giving informal advice to offenders individually, decided to conduct regular group discussions with them. The parole officer feels this has improved the adjustment of the offenders, and, by working closely with these nonprofessionals, he plans to develop the sessions into a formal structure for group treatment. He also thinks it might be well to use the offenders themselves to lead sessions, paralleling the model of the therapeutic communities in California and North Carolina. On an individual basis, he feels that offenders are sometimes skeptical about taking advice from each other but respond differently in a group situation.

This use of the offender himself in the group-treatment process seems to be gaining momentum. Essexfields, for example, is thinking of using its "helped" boys (those who have graduated from the program and have maintained themselves successfully in the community) to proliferate the Essexfields model. Essexfields duplicates the Highfields experiment with "guided group interaction," but instead of operating out of a rural institution, it conducts its program in a center in downtown Newark. Since the objective of "guided group interaction" is to change group norms, not to explore psychological motivation or develop self-insight, staff feel that those who emerge as the natural leaders of the group and whose later adjustment indicates an assimilation of positive norms probably can lead groups on their own. When they first set up Essexfields, they used a few of the former residents of Highfields to form the nucleus for the group and act as "culture carriers." They are planning to follow this same pattern to start new groups in other places, eventually hoping to use these "culture carriers" as group leaders, with the professionals' providing only consultative services. They are finding that their "helped" boys return regularly to the center months after they "graduate," an indication of their identification with the project.

Interest in using a member of the group to enhance the process of group change is also being expressed by probation departments experimenting with group counseling. The Hennepin County (Minneapolis) Probation Department, for example, has been exploring group treatment as a device for dealing with some of its young probationers. In the case of a group of 17- and 18-year-old girls, the professional in charge has appointed one of the members to serve as his "co-therapist," providing an "intermediary" between the group and the professional. The Nassau County Probation Department is thinking of doing the same thing, but they are planning to use their ex-probationers for this purpose. They are finding a number who wish to continue in group-counseling or group-discussion sessions after their probation period has ended. Staff feel that this is a potential that ought to be utilized, especially since they want to extend their support of probationers and expand their group-work and community-organization activities.

The Minnesota Department of Corrections has been carrying on an experiment in group supervision of adult parolees. The group is led by two "co-therapists," parole agents without special training who are supervised by the research director in charge of the experiment. Group discussions are centered around specific adjustment problems rather than therapeutic probing of personality. The Department is now extending this experiment by hiring two ex-inmates to head up additional groups. The research results will be published when sufficient data are available.

One issue that arises in using the offender as an intermediary between the group and the professional is the marginality of his role. He is on a par neither with staff nor with the group itself, so that a conflict in identification occurs. When he alone functions as the group's "therapist," this problem of identification is reduced because he is now more closely allied to staff, but only the most experimentally minded programs are thinking of moving in this direction. The question also arises of how far the group can go in making decisions. There would seem to be a legal issue, for example, in permitting a group of probationers to decide when one of its members is ready for release from the obligations of probation.

In general, the use of various forms of group treatment as a method of rehabilitating the offender is still so new as to make it difficult to say with any certainty what type of leader is needed for what type of approach and for what type of offender. Both Essexfields and Nassau County report, for example, that their group-work approach is effective only with certain types of youth—those from low socioeconomic backgrounds, particularly members of minority groups, whose delinquency more often represents the norms of their peers than any psychological deviation. California's Community Treatment Project reports that their various experiments with group-work methods have been successful with the "conformist" type of offenders but not with the more aggressive, independently minded delinquent. They are also finding that the effectiveness of staff varies depending on the approach being used. Contrary to their expectations, for example, they have found that the least sophisticated parole officer on the staff has proved to be the most effective leader of role-playing sessions.

Since California's Community Treatment Project is being conducted as a carefully controlled research experiment, it should yield some valuable clues as to the type of service and manpower needed to deal with the offender in the community. Should Nassau County undertake a program to utilize offenders as aides, they feel it would need to be done as a research project to evaluate the performance of the aides and the program as a whole.

But indications are that other agencies may not be so cautious either in developing group-therapy programs or involving nonprofessionals, particularly the offender. Group counseling may proliferate in community programs in the same unplanned, uncontrolled fashion that has characterized its growth in the institutional setting. From the experience of some of the Federal halfway houses, it would seem that group counseling oftentimes is employed because of the assumption that it is a "good thing," with little understanding of its purpose. There may be ample justification for using both professionals and nonprofessionals to conduct group sessions in the Federal centers (for example, since the character of the leadership affects the character of the sessions). Certain contradictions, however, creep into practice. A caseworker at one of the centers stated that although his sessions are less directive and more therapy-oriented than those conducted by the correctional officers, this factor is not considered in assigning youth to a particular group. The only consideration, other than available space, is friendship formations—not to reinforce them but to dissolve them—a practice that would seem to be contrary to the objectives group counseling is trying to achieve.

Group-Work Activities

Besides group counseling, various types of other group activities are developing in an attempt to provide a greater range of service for the offender in the community. The Hennepin County Probation Department, for example, carries on an extensive group-work program—a summer and weekend ranch program, trips down the Mississippi on a raft, a "flying club" for probationers who want to learn about airplane navigation, and a work project to improve work habits and to provide needed funds.

The two centers out of which California's Community Treatment Project operate offer a varied program that includes accredited classes for offenders who have returned from parole camp but who cannot enroll in school immediately; individual tutoring; shops in woodworking and automobile mechanics; arts and crafts; and a broad range of recreational, athletic, and cultural activities.

Such group-work activities are under professional direction, but nonprofessionals such as college students are being used either as aides or instructors for many of these activities. There is the feeling that a number of these functions can be performed by people with still less education, and that, in some cases, such as the vocational shops, it may be preferable to employ experienced craftsmen. The introduction of college students in the Community Treatment Project, for example, was largely the result of the fact that, if the program limited itself to the correctional staff, it could not command a sufficient range of skills to offer such a variety of activities. By using college students (many of whom are volunteers), they have at their disposal teachers, artists, and sociologists-in-training, all possible recruits for the correctional field. In one case, they employed a college student for the express purpose of relieving a parole officer of bussing the youths from school or home to the center.

Should the Community Treatment Project decide to employ other types of nonprofessionals, it feels that "general human services" skills would be more important than skills in a particular trade or subject. It would not want its functions to be defined narrowly. The person who drives the bus, for example, is at the same time "relating" to the offender and may also be called on to lead some group activity.

The Project is also thinking of giving priority to the ex-offender and to the youths enrolled in the Project. This parallels the thinking of other correctional agencies offering a group-work program. These agencies share the conviction of some of the correctional institutions that are employing inmates that the offender needs to learn how to assume responsibility. Group-work activities may provide this opportunity, and, by acting as buffer between the group and staff, the offender may be able to enhance the program and presumably the rehabilitation of the group. Helping others may also prove the key to his own rehabilitation. Moreover, probationers and parolees have a difficult time finding jobs, and, if a correctional agency employs them, it has some response to the criticism of employers that "it does not practice what it preaches."

For all of these reasons, interest is being expressed in using the offender as an aide in the group-work program. The Hennepin County Probation Department, for example, is thinking of having shorter raft trips in the future and using youths who have gone on these trips before to help staff supervise the group. For their "flying club," they are considering using some of the "graduates" as volunteer helpers for the next group that comes along. In both cases, the intent is to have the aides serve as interpreter between participants and staff. While identification may remain an issue they feel that, in these activities, roles can be structured to diminish the problem.

These activities, however, are all of a short-term nature and often involve strictly voluntary participation. The one line of continuity for those who perform well as aides might be in the work program where they could be employed as work-crew leaders for groups engaged in such projects as cleanup for the park department. The feeling is that this position does not require a great deal of formal education, but rather calls for maturity and a practical understanding of how to deal with people.

The work-crew leader, a new role gaining prominence in emerging youth-employment programs, is generally regarded as a position that can be filled by nonprofessionals (analogous to the foreman in private industry, the work-crew supervisor in public service, or the detail officer in correctional institutions). But in some of the newer correctional programs, the role is being used as the primary vehicle for teaching the offenders responsibility. This development was noted in an earlier chapter in this report, in describing the evolution of the therapeutic community at the California Institution for Men, and it has its counterpart in correctional programs in the community.

The Pinehills Project in Provo, Utah, for example, experimented with developing a therapeutic-community-type program for young offenders in a nonresidential urban center. The assumptions behind this program and the model employed were similar to Highfields, but with greater stress on the Cloward-Ohlin thesis of the need to provide opportunities, particularly employment, as a viable alternative to delinquent behavior. Part of the group activities involved Saturday work projects. Originally, nonprofessional work-crew supervisors were hired for this purpose, but "there was continual friction between the boys and the adult supervisors who were hired to direct them. These supervisors tended either to take an unbending authoritarian stance with the boys, or to be seduced by them, succumbing in the last case to manipulations in an apparent desire to be accepted by the boys."[7] Contrary to assumptions about the therapeutic value in physical labor, they found that, because of the relationship with the work supervisors, any effort to bridge the gap between the offender and staff through the group-treatment process was thwarted. Delinquent attitudes were, in fact, reinforced as a consequence.

In the third year of the project, they decided to try using the offenders themselves as work-crew supervisors. "Initially, the change resulted in anxiety and confusion. Boy supervisors now found themselves in the role of adults attempting to exercise control over their peers." But eventually it gave them some new insights. "Boys began to recognize for the first time some of the pressures that they had put previously upon those who had attempted to control them." The work improved, and the attitude of the boys changed. They could no longer place the blame for any problems that arose on the adult supervisors, so that in group sessions there was a more realistic examination of what the problems actually were and "what it meant to be an adult rather than a child."

On the other hand, the use of the boys did create problems in relations with the community. The friction that already existed between the project staff and the foremen of city departments was reinforced by this innovation. "Not only were foremen concerned about legal responsibility, but about the age, mode of dress, and mode of speaking of many of these offenders." But the contribution made by the work crews eventually won over city officials, with the result that they established a similar work program for nondelinquent youth and employed some of the boys from the project to act as supervisors. "Not all graduates of the experiment could perform the functions, but several could." Because of the experience at Provo, the director of the project is utilizing offenders as work supervisors in an aftercare residence in Los Angeles in a program he helped to develop. The results have been about the same. The work itself has no intrinsic therapeutic value; it is the supervisory role and the responsibility it develops that has some utility in the treatment process.

---

[7] This and subsequent quotations are taken from LaMar T. Empey, Maynard L. Erickson, and Max L. Scott, "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation," Fifth Annual Progress Report, 1963–64, Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University (mimeographed).

The experience with these two programs has implications for the creation of new opportunities for youth who cannot find jobs. As other agencies become aware of the need to consider the long-range career development of the offender, they may begin to assess their programs for possible roles at different levels of responsibility to equip the offender for "human services" work.

"Outreach Services"

The roles described above all have counterparts in the institutional setting, but there is an additional role that applies strictly to the community. It is closely associated with the practical, concrete assistance rendered by probation and parole officers and involves a variety of "outreach" services to help the offender adjust to the community.

In the preceding chapter, it was indicated that probation and parole departments have resisted separating out some of their functions on the grounds that all of them call for professional skills. On the other hand, there has been some precedent for involving nonprofessionals, particularly in the enlistment of volunteers to help offenders make the transition from institution to community. Michigan, for example, has been using volunteers to conduct group-counseling sessions in institutions. While this program was initiated as a device to help the offender adjust to the institution, in practice the major effect is to provide "a window to the world," with most of the sessions centered on the problems offenders can expect to face in the community. In Minnesota, the State correctional agency has worked out an agreement with an airline ex-stewardess association for the members, many of whom are now engaged in personnel work, to provide a recreation program and act as sponsors for girls in two cottages in the State training school. They provide a place for home visiting for girls when necessary, and they also help the girls find jobs. Volunteer sponsors perform similar functions for boys at the National Training School in Washington, D.C.

These programs, however, are generally not tied in with the work of parole officers, and the volunteers are largely middle class, often college-educated, people. Occasionally parolees or ex-parolees are called on to appear at a prerelease orientation session to explain to offenders what parole entails, but these have been isolated examples.

In contrast, some of the newer programs are attempting to employ nonprofessionals for functions of this type. The functions are greatly expanded, however, and the roles are related to professional staff. Moreover, since they are to serve as intermediary between the offenders and the professionals, an important factor in selection is closeness in background and experience to the offender himself.

From their experience with volunteers, for example, the Minnesota corrections agency is proposing to employ nonprofessionals to perform a role similar to their sponsors. These "case aides" would talk to parents, teachers, and law enforcement officials to get basic data on youth committed to institutions. The material they gather would be used by the professional caseworker. They might also help in completing reports for the various agencies and, as one official stated, "keep a pulse on the employment situation." Their training would involve "journalism techniques" that would help them elicit facts. Some aides might provide informal counseling, not of the "therapy" type, but more on the order of what the department terms "the football coach concept of casework."

In Minnesota, the lead is being taken by the agency that administers the State's correctional institutions. In other places where the case aide concept is being advocated, either a State or local agency operating institutional facilities or a private organization providing voluntary services to offenders is taking the lead. In view of the prevailing sentiment among probation and parole departments that their work requires professional skills, it is not surprising that most of the leadership is coming from other quarters.

Much of the experimentation in using nonprofessionals to provide outreach services is going on in New York City. In Harlem, for example, a church-sponsored organization is hoping to establish a halfway house for narcotics addicts in which professionals would supervise various phases of the program. Nonprofessionals, particularly rehabilitated addicts, would be employed to interview addicts in hospitals or institutions, to prepare them for the program, to speak before community groups, to locate jobs for the addicts, and to work with neighborhood youngsters who are showing signs of addiction. This organization currently operates out of a nonresidential center and is using aides for interviewing and job development purposes. Interestingly enough, the director who is an ex-addict himself feels that, for the group-treatment program, he would prefer using a professional.

Another organization in the same neighborhood, the Narcotics Committee of the East Harlem Protestant Parish, is proposing to use a street-work approach to identify teenage addicts and to influence them to seek help.

> The immediate goal is for the worker to become a part of the drug-using 'scene' to the extent that he is recognized as a useful link between the group and the various 'square' resources which may be useful to the group, such as: recreational, opportunity, legal advice, refuge from cold and rain, job opportunity, help in dealing with family tensions, and an objective resource for alleviating intergroup and intragroup tensions.[8]

There will be no educational requirements for "street workers," who will be recruited among local residents but they must be willing to continue their education in high school or college while working in the project. They will be supervised by professionals.

Another New York City program using nonprofessionals to perform outreach services is at Riker's Island, an institution for youthful offenders administered by the New York City Department of Corrections. This institution is conducting an experiment to test whether plastic surgery has any value as a rehabilitative device. In addition to the professional staff, a "field services aide" has been employed at the salary of $4,160 per year (there will be increments depending upon his performance) to interview prisoners, assist in the prerelease processing of those inmates who will enter the program, and accompany them to the hospital when they report for surgery.[9]

This aide also acts as a part-time intake worker at a center where offenders receive help in finding vocational training and employment. He will participate in the follow-up research phase of the program. Should he perform well, he will probably be absorbed by the department's research division on a permanent basis. In many respects, the role of this "field services aide" parallels that of graduate students employed in another Riker's Island project designed to test the value of vocational training as an aid in parole adjustment. The graduate students do intake work, accompany applicants on job interviews, help them fill out employment applications, check records, gather data, and administer tests. Having observed the performance of the field services aide, the director feels that people with less education could perform these duties.

---

[8] Narcotics Committee of the East Harlem Protestant Parish, "Proposals for Pilot Project of Work with Addicted Adolescents in the East Harlem Community," p. 5, no date (mimeographed).

[9] This aide was a participant in the training program for nonprofessionals to work in youth-employment programs sponsored by the National Committee on Employment of Youth. For a description of the content and method of training, see the Committee's Report, "Special Training Project for Semiprofessional Personnel," May and June 1965 (mimeographed).

The agency anticipating the most extensive use of nonprofessionals, particularly ex-offenders, is the New York State Division for Youth. Chapter 1 of this report described the Division's efforts to recruit its "graduates" for work in correctional facilities. While the Division plans to use them in a variety of tasks, major emphasis is being given to involving them in an aftercare program.

There is no legal control of probationers once they are released from the Division's residential centers, and the Division has had no way of relating its residential program to the later adjustment of the youths in the community. It has, therefore, set up a special research project to test the feasibility of providing aftercare services on a voluntary basis, using one center for a pilot project. Believing that the professional, because of a difference in values and cultural background, may not be able to communicate fully with the offender, the division is using its "graduates" to act as intermediaries, as the "eyes and legs" of the professional.

The initial function of the two aides[10] is to write to boys who have left the center, asking them about their school and work progress. Formerly these letters were signed by a professional from the Division's regular aftercare program, but the response is now better, if only because the boys are curious to know how "one of their own" ever came to be a staff member. If they do not respond or indicate an interest in receiving help, the aftercare aides will follow up with a home visit. If the aide feels that there is a serious problem involved, he arranges to have the boy meet with his supervisor, a professional social worker. Otherwise, he provides practical help if it is needed.

Often this involves helping a boy find a job. The aide assists the boy in making out a referral form to be sent to the Division for Youth's employment specialist. If an interview is arranged, the aide may meet with the boy beforehand to help him prepare—to advise him about his appearance, behavior, the factors he ought to consider in deciding whether the job is suitable, etc. After the interview, the aide then meets the boy again to find out what happened and to offer him any further advice that might be needed.

---

[10] The selection and training of these aides was described in Chapter 1 of this report, pp. 16 ff.

In some cases, the aide's assistance may amount to no more than simply extending the hand of friendship. As one of the aides commented, "The boys feel pretty close to each other while they are at the center, but when they graduate, they live too far away to see each other, and they have either lost contact or they don't want to associate with their old pals—so what I may do is simply say, 'Come on, let's go to a movie.' " Sometimes the aide may visit a boy just to observe how he is getting along and report "any signs of trouble" to the professional.

The supervisor meets with the aides once a week to discuss their cases. When they were first employed, he trained them in the techniques of interviewing and report writing, discussed with them the kinds of problems they might anticipate, the clues they might look for in assessing the boys' adjustment, and informed them of agencies in the community to which they could refer boys for appropriate help.

Staff feels that in the main these boys have worked out well. However, they note that even though the total project is being evaluated, it is difficult to isolate this one element or to have any scientific evidence to prove what is simply their "general impression." The fact that some boys may not respond could mean that the aides were not relating well or, on the other hand, could mean that the boys were able to adjust satisfactorily on their own. Moreover, since the program is employing only two aides, both carefully selected, it could be that these two are "special" and that very few other graduates could perform in the same manner.

Even in their case, some problems have been observed. One staff member noted that a number of the boys resisted accepting their peers as part of staff. Often this has been only an initial reaction and disappears over time. The aides themselves noted another problem, the ill-defined nature of their jobs. Sometimes, for example, when they visit a boy who has no specific problem and they simply try starting a conversation with him, they feel uncomfortable, especially when he asks, "Why are you here?" They prefer the role of residential supervisor in which functions are more structured.

Staff is aware that the lack of specifically defined functions is a problem. They note that this has been one of the major reasons for initial professional resistance. There was no job description to quiet the professional's fears that he might be replaced. On the other hand, the unstructured nature of the role makes it difficult to detail the specific functions the aide performs—and, since aides are engaged in field work, the supervisor does not necessarily know what they are doing at any one time. This degree of freedom means that the aides must be extremely dependable, must identify strongly with the project—a quality that is not characteristic of offenders or, for that matter, of most workers.

The Division hopes that this program can become a recruitment device. "It is hoped that the youth, while in our employ, will begin higher education to prepare them for professional careers."[11] While the Division is attempting to create regular civil service positions for these boys to work as group supervisors in their centers, there is no career line for them to pursue in aftercare services. Staff are concerned about this issue and question the "morality of training persons in the area of social services, having them develop the personal dignity of a social-service worker, but then forcing them to seek employment elsewhere." Because of the ill-defined nature of the role these aides perform, it is difficult to convince civil service to establish positions for them as aftercare workers. The position of group supervisor already exists, and only minor modifications are needed to develop it into a role for Division "graduates." Moreover, there is some difference of opinion among staff as to the level of responsibility the aides can assume. Their supervisor would like them to find jobs for youth directly, without having to make referrals to the Division's employment specialist. On the other hand, those in charge of the regular aftercare program feel that the job-development function requires a professional. Because of his experience and contacts, the specialist is able to cut through red tape and expedite employment. The aide would have neither the experience nor the know-how to establish the same personal ties with employers and employment agencies.

Regardless of the problems that have resulted from the employment of these aides, staff nevertheless feels that on the whole they have made a contribution, particularly with respect to the most important criterion of success, "relating well to the boys." Whether this is the result of their status as ex-offenders or their own personality is another question. It was assumed that graduates would prove a role model for the other boys to emulate, but this is a moot point. As the previous discussion indicated, the very fact that they were former members of the peer group sometimes proved more a hindrance than a help.

There is also a special problem that is faced in employing offenders. Though the New York City Department of Corrections, for example, is willing to experiment with the use of nonprofessionals, it is unable to use its "graduates," who in this case would be parolees, because of the legal restrictions against parolees' associating with each other.

---

[11] New York State Division for Youth, "A Proposal for the Establishment of an After-Care Service for Delinquent Youth Released from the Lewisohn Rehabilitation Center," no date, p. 3 (mimeographed).

Integrating Treatment of the Offender with Social Welfare Services

The stress on community treatment has brought about the realization that services to the offender cannot be isolated from the community's total response to social welfare needs. Antipoverty programs again have helped to stimulate this development. With their mandate stress on comprehensiveness and coordination, they have put the focus on *community needs.* As a consequence, in such places as Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles, California, group residences are being established that are open to anyone who needs a sheltered-home situation regardless of his legal status.

Another stimulus is the recognition that, unless the larger community is involved, efforts to reduce institutionalization will be thwarted. In almost every place where community residences have been established, there has been local opposition. On the other hand, such efforts as the Santa Monica project to educate the community to prevent delinquency indicate that, when the attempt is made to involve the community, their cooperation can be enlisted and their attitudes toward delinquents can be changed.[12]

From a practical standpoint, probation and parole departments are finding that, as they expand their range of activities, it is increasingly difficult to restrict their clientele to offenders. When groups of probationers are formed to engage in some activity, the department can hardly say, "No," when a member wants to bring a friend along, especially when the intent is to strengthen group ties. If the youth is interested in participating in an activity, should the opportunity be closed to him because he has committed no offense? As one correctional official observed, "This may serve to encourage crime"—an observation that, in fact, has some validity. For example, when California established its Community Treatment Project, runaways from county probation camps increased, because the boys heard that if they got remanded to the Youth Authority, they might be included in the Project and thus be kept in the community instead of being institutionalized.

Correctional agencies are also finding that, because they have developed expertise in dealing with the offender, they are called upon to provide services to troubled youngsters over whom they have no legal claim. The probation department in Minneapolis, for example, is thinking of providing a counseling program for youngsters referred to the court but not adjudicated. Parents and other agencies have requested that they provide such service, because it is unavailable elsewhere and the probation department seems the logical choice. Should it offer such a program, however, it would be operating without the legal controls it normally exercises.

---

[12] For fuller information on this program, see Herbert R. Sigurdson, Donald G. Dodge, Annette Gromfin, and Rudy Sanfilippo, "Community Education for Delinquency Prevention," *Correction in the Community, Alternatives to Incarceration,* Monograph No. 4, Board of Corrections, State of California, June 1964, pp. 7–18.

The concept that skills acquired in correctional work have wider application is one of the assumptions behind the New Careers Development Project, described in Chapter 2, "New Roles for Inmates." If an inmate has sufficient perception and insight to analyze offenders' behavior, then it is assumed that these same skills can be employed in examining community problems and in introducing needed change. In line with this thinking, the New Careers Development Project is training its teams to consider the changes required for a community to provide an adequate response to the problems of poverty. Through informal seminars, role playing, and a system of self-rating, trainees are intensifying their powers of judgment and broadening their knowledge and understanding of local power structures, of the culture of the deprived, and of the institutions the community establishes to cope with its problems. As a result of this training, one team has been assigned the task of studying the feasibility of creating new roles for nonprofessionals. As a first step, they have analyzed State civil service positions, preparatory to writing job descriptions that will redesign professional functions. As a second step, they will observe community programs where nonprofessionals are being utilized to assess the results. A second team will be engaged in evaluating a pilot project to improve the reading and language skills of culturally deprived youngsters. The potential developed in the correctional field is thus being utilized to render a service to the total community.

As in any attempt to integrate services, this move is facing resistance by correctional agencies. While they may want to extend their services into the community, they do not want the process to be reversed. The Provo, Utah, experiment, for example, reported opposition from the probation department, partially because of a difference in approach, but also because the department resented this intrusion into its province. The sense of competition that developed did produce one good result: the department improved its service to the point where it practically matched the effectiveness of the experiment. On the other hand, the department's pressure helped to bring about the end of the experiment.

Resistances by probation departments may result in either costly duplication of services or continued unmet needs. In one community, for example, the department has been working closely with the local antipoverty program to develop a position for probation aides. The staff of the antipoverty program feel that there are other youths in the target area who could use the services of a nonprofessional "outreach" worker, particularly if he were neighborhood-based. But the department, fearful of losing its control, has resisted this effort. Moreover, because of its professional bias and concern that nonprofessionals may pose a risk to the agency, it is willing to employ aides only for routine functions but not as general "human services" workers. Indications are that, because of the power the department can exert, if any aide position is established, it will represent the thinking of the department and not of the antipoverty agency.

Nor is the onus only on probation departments or correction agencies in general. Integration and coordination of services will demand invasion of territory on both sides, and, with corrections considered the stepchild of social welfare, social agencies will not welcome any extension of its services. And the question remains, in view of the legal character of probation and parole, to what extent can they move into the broader social-welfare field?

CONCLUSION

Distinguishing between Manpower and Program Issues

We have described current trends and experiments in manpower utilization, both in different types of institutions and in agencies serving the offender in the community. The material is more detailed with respect to program than to personnel considerations because the primary focus of innovations has been improvement in service. There has been only secondary emphasis on a more rational use of staff. This is neither unexpected nor undesirable. The goals and programs of agencies or organizations generally produce the manpower considerations; they are derivative rather than controlling. In corrections, manpower issues are even more complicated than in other fields because goals relating to treatment of offenders vary. Even where it is agreed that offenders should be rehabilitated, there are strongly conflicting views on how to accomplish this.

As a result of these disagreements, issues arise that seem to be connected with manpower, but are actually programmatic. If the disagreement is based on conflicting concepts of how a job is to be done, argument about the relative merits of professionals and nonprofessionals tends to become meaningless. For example, if a program involves nondirective therapy, it will be desirable to have it under the firm control of persons trained in psychoanalytic concepts. On the other hand, if the purpose of a projected system of group treatment is to smooth over the rough edges of institutional living, the group leader may be hindered from achieving maximum effect by such professional concerns as uninvolvement. Such disputes cannot be resolved by manpower considerations, since they stem from quite different program goals. The clarification of those goals is a problem that belongs to corrections rather than to manpower theory.

In this regard, it is important to distinguish the use of inmates from attempts to establish other nonprofessional positions. Even though inmates are involved in a large proportion of the manpower experiments in the corrections field, it is difficult to incorporate this experience into a broader manpower policy. The work of inmates is often assigned with some other-than-manpower goal in mind—improved adjustment to the institution, training for an occupation with a view to the future outside or, generally, as a rehabilitative device. As soon as these considerations enter the picture, the work role of the inmate becomes less important.

For our purposes, we wish to make it clear that the rehabilitative adjustment aspects of a work role in an institution are not appropriately judged by manpower standards. The effects can be judged only by corrections experts against specific criteria of success. We are trying to assess work functions; programs were included in the text to point out that jobs can be developed and filled without resorting to standard educational and experience requirements.

Within an institution, as programing becomes richer in educational or cultural activities, job possibilities occur in a number of areas—scheduling and arranging of activities, design and construction of facilities, teaching and supervision of groups. The introduction of an educational program based in part on programed instruction opens up possibilities for inmate activity, as does trade training, which can use the skills it develops either outside or within the institution. If research expands, there are a number of functions that inmates can be trained to perform. The administration and leadership in the institution may wish to make these activities an integral part of a total program that they deem desirable for inmates. This task is beyond the scope of manpower theory.

The same problem arises with respect to the expansion of the role of correctional officers. Most of the programs described have had the reshaping of staff attitudes as a primary goal. This is, for example, an important function of group counseling, which is often used as a technique to bring critical personnel closer to treatment and further from a strictly custodial approach. To put it differently, if the therapeutic value of group sessions is greater for the staff than for the prisoners, the manpower implications become somewhat obscure and difficult to assess.

None of this is meant to diminish the importance of innovations focusing on such variables as attitude change. It is simply that the realm of discourse belongs to corrections theory, and manpower considerations are secondary. It is possible to assess relative performance in these roles, but this kind of functional comparison should not be confused with the problem of judging the effectiveness of treatment.

The problem in assessing manpower innovations is not altogether due to ambiguities of program. It is also connected with the *ad hoc* character of the innovations and the failure to address the issues in sufficiently broad terms. The typical innovation affects only a segment of the occupational structure. It has not provided a stimulus for looking at the utilization of personnel across the board. With the focus on issues other than manpower, there has been little attempt to draw from these innovations the implications for systematic utilization of new kinds of personnel, descriptions of their functions, and the creation of a rational structure of employment. The kinds of training needed to perform new roles have not been specified functionally, nor has there been an evaluation of the comparative effectiveness in particular jobs of people with different levels of education and training. One result has been that assumptions develop about the kind of work that nonprofessionals are competent to do, assumptions that are practiced widely and duplicated but never tested.

Some agencies, contemplating the innovations in which attempts have been made to utilize nonprofessionals, see no relevance to their own program and retain the conviction that none of their work is appropriate for handling by a nonprofessional. Others have romanticized the role of the nonprofessional in corrections and see it restricted to former offenders who, by virtue of their "common experience" with the offender group, are thought to possess some mystical quality that makes them better able to relate to offenders than anyone else, regardless of training or aptitude. Somewhere in between are those who see the only nonprofessional role as providing a bridge between the client and the professional, equating the definition "nonprofessional" with "non-middle-class."

From a manpower point of view, the nonprofessional group must be seen as consisting of all those who do not meet the standard of professional status in any particular agency. It includes persons with a wide range of educational achievement, a variety of social and economic backgrounds, and possessing an equally wide range of skills, experience, and aptitude. Therefore, their use cannot be restricted to any one role; they should be viewed as having the potential to fill a variety of roles in a variety of programs.

Need for Assessing Manpower Requirements

If corrections agencies, facing serious personnel shortages, are to make optimum use of the nonprofessional potential, they must learn to assess their needs in terms of functions. We are not contesting the primacy of program. Nevertheless, we are convinced that manpower can and must be considered a separate issue.

Manpower experiments indicate that correctional agencies, as private employers, have been underestimating the potential of the nonprofessional group. Educational and experimental requirements are established more often because they provide a shortcut in the hiring process rather than because the educational content and the experience are relevant to the job.

However, while meeting these requirements may be an indicator of potential to do a job, it is not necessarily the best or the only indicator. For example, when one institution attempted to train all of its correctional officers to become counselors, it discovered that level of education was not a factor of success. More important were personality characteristics—a liking for people and an ability to work with people and gain their respect—factors unrelated to years of schooling. Regardless of prior education, the correctional officers all had to be trained for the counseling job.

Such experiences suggest that there may be better means for selecting candidates than by rigid criteria for educational achievement and experience. More informal methods, such as intensive interviewing and a probationary learning period, may be more appropriate. Agencies and employers may feel it unnecessary to revise traditional methods while there are more candidates than jobs. But the reverse situation applies in corrections. Here, there is every reason to change such practices in order to include the entire potential source of manpower. The War on Poverty and the need to find new opportunities for the unemployed and the underemployed is still another reason such basic changes in hiring practices are in order.

Experimentation with program need not preclude an assessment of the current organizational structure of correctional agencies to determine how manpower can be utilized more effectively. Experience indicates that shortages of manpower, whether in social welfare or private industry, by themselves rarely produce basic changes in hiring practices or more rational use of existing personnel. The tendency is to make-do within the system, primarily at the expense of service to the client.

The move to establish a Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training and the recently enacted Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act clearly indicate an intention to focus on manpower. Nevertheless, there is reason to believe that the problem may be attacked more from the vantage point of finding ways to attract professionals to the field and raising professional standards than of assessing functions and engaging in job redesign, although there is an attempt to standardize goals and tasks. Some of the more advanced institutional systems have begun to address themselves to evaluating professional functions and establishing new career lines that will close the gap between the nonprofessional and the professional, but they are doing so on their own, and their innovations seem to be largely ignored in whatever overall assessment of manpower issues exists. Community agencies, with their stress on increasing professionalism, represent the dominant viewpoint.

It is our position that both the professional and the nonprofessional have a role to perform in providing rehabilitative services to the offender and that both, after hiring, require increments of training and experience to carry out the mandate of any agency. The issues are in the realm of what functions each should perform and, just as important, what possibilities for career development each can reasonably expect.

In the light of the need in corrections to learn to utilize the potential of the nonprofessional group, agencies will have to develop a willingness to study the role of those personnel with the highest level of training to see whether all the functions they perform really demand the levels of education and experience that have been established as hiring criteria for those jobs. Such study should provide the basis for redefining those jobs, reserving for those with the most training the most complex functions and establishing for the remaining functions a continuum of jobs with appropriate hiring criteria.

Within the professional groups in some agencies this is already being done. Some probation agencies, for example, offer a two-year intensive training program to entry-level professionals who have only B.A. degrees. While in training, they are assigned to cases the agency feels they can handle under close supervision. Furthermore, they are offered assistance to continue their formal education, thus providing them with an opportunity to upgrade themselves to a higher level.

In addition to such efforts to upgrade college graduates, innovations described in this report sometimes indicate a willingness among the innovators to assign functions normally performed by their professionals to people who may not have a college education. Some new roles have been developed in this fashion. However, with the exception of a few advanced institutional systems, there has been no attempt to provide such nonprofessionals the same opportunities to develop their potential and to advance to higher jobs as is accorded college graduates in positions classified as professional.

An agency, for example, may assign a competent clerk to routine data-gathering tasks otherwise done by a professional, may use an aide to help at intake, or may use a nonprofessional investigator for nonsensitive cases. However, no connections have been established between these jobs, so that there is no line of progression from one to the next. Each innovation has been for a discrete purpose and not part of a total plan for rationalizing manpower structure. The jobs have not been graded to provide a continuum from one to the next. No offer of training or education is made that might stimulate a desire to advance. Hiring is not accomplished through internal promotion; applicants for each job are recruited from outside the agency. Finally, there has been no willingness to regard such nonprofessional positions as a potential source of personnel who could be developed into professional workers. The result is a discontinuous employment structure. It fails to utilize the potential of its present staff for filling job vacancies, discourages some workers from staying on their job because they see no advancement possibilities, and discourages applications from competent candidates who are interested in career development.

The material that follows addresses itself to the question of how to provide such continuity in the organizational structure of employment. It presents models for new career lines for nonprofessionals. It demonstrates how roles can be assessed and functions redesigned to provide a progression of jobs demanding a progression of skills and training.

Models for New Career Lines

We recognize that there is no agreement in the field on the degree of training correctional functions require. Studies currently under way at the University of California and other institutions on training of professionals should throw more light on the subject. It is possible, however, to make at least tentative judgments based on the experience of using nonprofessionals in corrections and related work. The roles we describe represent a synthesis of such current practice. In themselves, they are not new; what is new is the framework in which they are presented, the vertical structure providing for upgrading and career development.

Although they can be applied to the institutional setting, these models purposely have been placed in the context of the community to encourage community agencies to reassess their manpower requirements. With corrections moving in the direction of stressing service in the community in preference to institutionalization, new forms of community treatment have been developing, inviting experimentation with manpower. Moreover, the focus of community treatment pushes it in the direction of related welfare services, thus creating a wider scope for personnel development than would be the case in corrections alone.

Two new career lines are being presented—one addressed to casework, the other to group work—which represent the fundamental methods of providing service to the offender. We recognize that, by necessity, there must be some overlap of casework and group-work functions; the distinction between the two should be considered one of emphasis rather than of fixed separation.

The job designs and the guidelines that follow should not be implemented slavishly. By far the greatest hazard of undertaking innovations in this field is the substitution of new rigidities for old ones. One purpose in presenting these models is to provide a means for testing manpower assumptions. As new approaches to corrections are applied, experimentation must be the guideline; precise definitions of role and relevant training may have to evolve out of the experience of professionals and nonprofessionals working together.

The material that follows, then, should be regarded as directional guidelines for agencies that are ready to reassess their own manpower practices. It is presented to encourage the corrections field to consider its manpower requirements at all levels and to explore further the utilization and development of nonprofessionals as one major solution to its needs. These models and guidelines provide a set of ground rules for manpower innovations to carry present knowledge to a more advanced state.

The two models, for casework and group work, both introduce three new levels below the professional. Each level of functioning is distinguished from the next by an increase in skills, responsibility, impact on the client, and ability to conceptualize. The higher levels require an increment in training and experience.

While all three levels can become permanent work stations for an individual, the fundamental plan relates them into a sequence for potential upgrading. The tasks selected bear a direct and discernible relationship to the skills required for performance at a higher level; each provides both a testing and a training ground for the next.

The lowest level, particularly, serves to screen workers and orient them to the goals and general methods of the organization. Although entry-level functions relate to the work of the agency and provide permanent jobs, they are designed primarily to permit screening of a fairly undifferentiated group of applicants, either for the next level on the continuum or for other jobs within the agency.

It is at the middle level that the worker really assumes a casework or group-work role and where more formal training and selection criteria are required. It is at this level, for example, that the worker may function in the role currently most associated with nonprofessional employment, that of the intermediary between the client and the agency.

By the third level, the worker is expected to function in what might be called a semiprofessional capacity, in which he is working under limited supervision. Those reaching this level should be considered as candidates for the newly designed professional roles. Also, for purposes of achieving a truly rational structure, oppportunities should be made available to individuals at this level through which they can advance into the traditional professional disciplines.

Even with an intensive training program, it should be assumed that the number of people who will become eligible for promotion from within will diminish with each succeeding level. Consequently, the model is designed to permit entry from outside the agency at each level and assumes that new recruits will have to meet standards of training and experience at the higher levels.

At each level, a variety of tasks is included to test the worker's potential and, at the same time, to develop the complex of skills that the agency requires. Since nonprofessionals are a heterogeneous group, the variety of tasks also makes it possible to utilize more of them and provides a better test of their potential. If the structure of the agency permits specialization, it may be that, once past the probationary and training period, the worker's role will be limited to certain groups of functions that capitalize on the particular aptitude he displays. For example, a distinction is made in the casework model between functions that involve contact with clients and those that do not.

The models are divided into different levels to show the possibilities for career development, not to separate workers from each other. The plan is designed with the assumption that, in its implementation, wherever feasible, workers from all levels will function together as a unit. The entry worker performs the routine tasks, the aide and the semiprofessional serve as the "eyes, ears, and legs" of the professional, and the professional, in turn, act as the chief diagnostician, the specialist, the chief supervisor or trainer. With this type of redistribution of roles and team functions, staff will learn from each other, and the contributions of each will result in a more effective service to the offender.

The Casework Model

Casework relies on an ability to communicate with the client and to gather, record, and interpret materials through interviews, observation, and other information sources. The progression of tasks suggested is intended to develop these skills.

If the size of the agency permits, some entry workers should concentrate on direct service to the client, while others should be involved in more impersonal tasks. Such a division permits some job rotation for the development of an all-around ability to function or specialization in the area of work for which the individual worker demonstrates greatest aptitude.

A possible entry job involving contact with the client is that of receptionist-intake worker. In this capacity, the worker will be called on to greet clients, determine where they should be seen and refer them to the proper office, make appointments, and record simple factual data. Other tasks may involve serving as an escort to clients when they are referred to other agencies, the courts, or for job interviews. Some workers may be able to help clients complete simple forms or assist in administering standard tests.

Entry tasks that do not involve direct client contact include: record-keeping; transmittal of form letters to employers, landlords, school personnel, health and welfare agencies, etc.; and telephone verification of basic factual data.

In addition, those workers who demonstrate maturity and responsibility should be introduced to rudimentary elements of field work. Such tasks as visiting police precincts to pick up appropriate forms or visiting schools to gather records will be among the introductory field tasks suitable for entry workers.

While many additional tasks could be described, most important is that they be simple, well defined, capable of standardization and of being learned with minimal formal instruction. Entry workers may be used partially in general office routines, but care must be exercised that such work does not become their major activity. They should be given a variety of assignments, and no one worker should be held at one repetitive task indefinitely, since a major objective is to discover and develop skills. They will also need some formal training to orient them to the goals of the agency and the approaches employed in dealing with people and eliciting information.

At the intermediate level, the worker will be performing as a true case aide. He will need greater skills for dealing with people. At this level, he should be able to gather nonsensitive data through either simple informal interviews or structured questionnaires. He also should be able to do more than simply verify factual data. For example, he might be called on to telephone an employer to ascertain whether an offender is on the job. At the same time, he should be able to inform the professional about the employer's reactions to the offender and whether any special problems exist which need professional attention. With proper development and training, the aide will be able to carry on some of the reporting functions that presently occupy so large a percentage of the professional's time.

It is primarily at the aide level that the nonprofessional will be called on to serve as a bridge between the client and the professional. He may perform a variety of tasks to help the professional assist the offender with a myriad of practical problems. He may, for example, coach the offender on appearance and behavior at a job interview, appraise him of welfare requirements, help him in apartment-hunting or involve him in some social activity. The key factor is that the aide be given specific duties that are clearly defined with limitations set, so that he can feel comfortable in his role and, at the same time, not overstep his competence.

The aide may either be assigned to a single professional caseworker and function as his adjunct in the less sensitive areas of field work and counseling or be used as a general aide to several professionals, whether they be caseworkers, job developers, or others. This will depend upon whether professionals are utilized in the agency as generalists or specialists. The important thing is that while an aide is considered a trainee he should be given some exposure to the variety of activities that a professional encounters. Later, should the structure of the agency permit, an aide may function exclusively in the role of what might be called "the client's representative," while another who can function with little supervision and shows aptitude for data gathering may fill such a specialized job as the newly created release-on-recognizance investigator's position.

To function at this level, the worker will need formal training in addition to learning his specific tasks from demonstration and observation. He will need to be trained in interviewing and reporting techniques and to be given some orientation to the basic problems of offenders in relating to the community. He will need some information on the policies and practices of the network of community agencies. He will need to be taught how to respect the confidentiality of records and to distinguish between those matters he can handle and those requiring professional attention.

While the position of case aide may become a permanent work station for many of those recruited at lower levels, for some it will be a stepping stone to semiprofessional status, requiring further training and development of the skills employed at the aide level. Those able to work without close supervision and whose skills in gathering information, interpreting, and reporting are deemed sufficient may be given almost independent caseloads of the so-called "good risk" cases such as nonsupport or other misdemeanor actions where processing involves the supervision of payments or restitution of funds. Such workers should be expected to be sufficiently sensitive to the problems in an individual's case so that they can screen out those who either require or desire counseling or professional supervision.

Another possibility is that the semiprofessional will handle, under minimal supervision, the nonsensitive issues concerning residence, employment, education, etc., of even the poorer risk cases. With respect to employment, for example, the semiprofessional can be sufficiently trained to act as a job developer for an individual case and offer some general job guidance to an offender. In those activities, he would work as an assistant to a professional worker rather than in an independent fashion.

The Group-Work Model

A similar broad, three-level progression can be designed for nonprofessional group workers. Although the three levels correspond to those in casework in terms of general skill level and the degree of responsibility and judgment required, the method of working and relationship to supervision is different. At the entry level, for example, while casework trainees begin with simple tasks which can be performed independently under some form of group supervision, the group workers at the entry level are assigned as assistants to group leaders.

The precise functions at the entry level will vary according to the nature of the group and its activities. In a residential setting, for example, the worker may be assigned to assist with the supervision of eating, sleeping, or general care of living quarters. In a recreation or work program, the entry tasks might include escorting group members from one activity to another, distributing materials, roll-taking, and the like.

In the performance of such tasks, the trainee will have the opportunity to observe the group supervisor and to be observed himself. With experience, it is possible to allow the trainees to record their observations in, at first, oral and, later, written form. This provides a further indication of ability to carry on more responsible work within a group situation. Whatever functions he is assigned, it is important that they be specific and that his role be structured; he should not be expected simply to "relate" to the group, especially when he may have problems of identifying as a staff person. "Relating well" is, of course, essential and should be the key test by which his potential is judged, but this should be a skill he applies in the performance of any of his duties, even when, for example, he is bussing children to the program headquarters.

At the intermediate level, the worker functions as the supervisor for a group similar to the one in which he formerly assisted or a subdivision of that group. This promotion will depend on the ability to train an assistant, as well as to lead a small residential work or recreation group. At this level, the worker must be able to follow a schedule, assume responsibility for materials, and deal effectively with routine behavioral problems; he will need training to be able to decide when to call for professional assistance.

The third, or semiprofessional level, requires the acquisition of specific skills. At this level, some workers may be engaged in the remediation of educational defects, for example. Others may actually instruct in specific work or recreational skills. Still others, who display ability to negotiate with outside institutions, may be used to deal with schools, social and welfare agencies, and other institutions to gain acceptance for the offender group or to provide additional services. Some may be trained to lead group discussions, either with offenders, their families, or community groups. Specialization in one or more of such activities should provide a test of the motivation and aptitude for further advancement.

The functions mentioned are just a few of the possibilities—all drawn from current practice. As an agency begins to assess its activities to create new roles for nonprofessionals, it will discover others they can perform. Moreover, the addition of personnel will make it possible for the agency to expand its service, which in turn will uncover additional functions suitable for nonprofessionals. With additional manpower, a probation agency, for example, may be able to assume greater responsibility for screening misdemeanants, employing a semiprofessional to identify potential problem individuals. The semiprofessional could also see to it that they receive the service that will prevent them from becoming candidates for institutions. With additional manpower, fewer children may be placed in detention facilities because there will be someone who can be given the responsibility for acting as their surrogate parent to guarantee their appearance in court. Or, given a pool of casework aides, an agency can establish an advisory service for families of offenders. And as for group-work activities, a wide variety could be instituted, from camping to youth employment programs. Clearly, the range of possibilities is considerable.

More important than the specific tasks to be performed is the developmental sequence that provides a continuum of tasks from the lowest level to the highest. Precise tasks and the number of job gradations obviously will vary with the size and variety of functions of any agency.

The routes taken by individuals will also vary. While our models suggest a structure that would make it possible for a nonprofessional to advance, they are based on the assumption that each level will be designed as a worthwhile job in itself. Someone either unable or unwilling to advance to a higher level casework position, for example, but who is experienced in the particular job, may prefer instead to supervise others doing the same work. Given the maturity and ability to assume such responsibility, he should be allowed such opportunity. The structure, therefore, must be kept sufficiently flexible to permit movement, both horizontally and vertically.

The models presented in this section have been described purposely in broad, general terms to allow for adaptation to the specific setting; they may be modified in a number of ways. For example, an agency may find it more appropriate to establish one entry-level job from which the worker can move into group work, casework, research, or whatever other activity applies to the agency. Casework and group work have been separated in the models because traditionally they have been considered two separate disciplines. Since the focus is the testing and development of potential, a good case could be made for combining the two at the entry level, particularly since an aide or semiprofessional may need to employ both skills. In considering the implementation of these models, then, agencies must expect to engage in considerable advance planning of their own to develop a structure appropriate to their needs.

Implementing the Models

Planning

Advance planning at many levels is fundamental to the effective implementation of these models. However, in considering the planning stages necessary for implementing the suggested job patterns, an agency will have to concern itself not only with internal concerns, but also with extra-agency factors.

Planning will have to encompass the specifics of the job to be designed and also the dynamics of the relationship of the new role to the employment structure of the agency. It will also have to consider the civil service system if the agency is a public one, the professional societies and associations and the professional training centers or graduate training institutions which set the standards of education and experience that are the basis of professional accreditation. This will require time, skill, patience, and the commitment of the staff to the validity and importance of the new jobs.

Negotiating these various levels of organization and overcoming the resistances, hesitations, and inertia that will be encountered must be recognized as a major undertaking. It may require the attention of a number of ranking staff members. It should also be recognized, however, that increasingly there is a climate of receptiveness to this pattern of altering employment relationships. For all the difficulties, it must be noted that there have been successful examples and that more are winning acceptance all the time.

Within an agency, it is generally not enough for one branch or department to adopt a plan used elsewhere with success. When this is the case, the new roles will tend to be isolated from other functions. The result will be but another occupation within a discontinuous structure. Connections between different occupational levels and between specialties within each level are essential to maximum staff development. Such connections do not arise spontaneously but depend on involving the entire staff in the preliminary planning stages. Frequently, this involvement is also the best technique for minimizing staff resistance to a redefinition of jobs.

It is unlikely that any advance plan, no matter how carefully considered, can be implemented unchanged in all respects. An experimental approach is mandatory, and this calls for built-in flexibility, for periodic review, and for methods by which both new employees and regular staff can report their observations. Techniques by which phases of a plan as well as the overall staffing effectiveness can be measured need consideration. If such measures are not established at the outset, the appropriate data will be lacking when evaluation is deemed desirable.

Ideally, all functions within an organization, both those currently performed and those which may be added in the future, need to be catalogued, reviewed, and rated in accordance with the skill, maturity, education or training necessary for performance. With such a catalogue, it is possible to redesign old jobs and develop new nonprofessional roles. However, understaffed agencies frequently cannot assign personnel to this task. It may be necessary for such agencies to secure special budgetary allotments for this purpose or to utilize outside consultants in the preliminary stages. Failing this, it may be expedient to experiment on a limited trial-and-error basis when introducing a new role for testing, mindful of the way such fragments fit into the whole.

Recruitment and Selection

Nowhere is an experimental approach more necessary than in consideration of recruitment and selection techniques. Recruitment confined to civil service lists and selection which adheres to conventional personnel stereotypes for education and experience may serve only to perpetuate manpower problems. Selection cannot be a discrete event. It should be an ongoing process in which tests of suitability for the work reveal the desired information as the candidate actually works on a job, as his training proceeds, and as his performance is measured and evaluated.

In addition to recruiting people within the agency, there are outside sources that will be especially suitable for recruitment purposes. The new antipoverty programs, for example, may provide possibilities for recruitment of individuals with strong ties to the community in which the offender needs to find a place. Inmates and ex-offenders are another possible source. Outreach recruitment techniques may be important if the nonprofessionals are to provide liaison between the offender and the professional staff. An explicit job design which delineates not only the functions but also the promotional possibilities will attract those to whom service to offenders might indicate a vocational opportunity and may produce applicants with a variety of backgrounds, training, and experience.

In screening new recruits, it is important that the agency avoid using traditional devices that reject out-of-hand large groups of applicants before their potential can be tested. This is particularly important in view of the current need to explore new opportunities for the unemployed and the underemployed. Planners should deliberately include those persons traditionally denied similar employment opportunities to test whether such persons can be developed to fill those jobs. Included in this group would be minority group members, high school dropouts, and, most notably, ex-offenders to whom corrections has an especial obligation.

A flexible approach to screening does not mean that no criteria should be established for selecting applicants. Factors that should be considered can include age, maturity, a minimum degree of literacy, an ability to make judgments appropriately, an aptitude for working well with people, an interest in the job, and articulateness. But the agency should avoid equating these attributes with levels of schooling. Nor can it be assumed that formal tests will discriminate these criteria. Test results should be used as guides to the development of a new worker or as tentative measures of where he might best be placed rather than as a basis for initial selection.

Major reliance in selection should be placed on intensive interviews, indications of aptitude from previous work experience and, to a more limited extent, such simulated work situations as role playing. Selection interviewers will themselves need to be trained, since the approach needed for implementing these models is different from the traditional job interview.

For the selection of those to be promoted to the higher nonprofessional levels, the task is not so complicated. Presumably, the entry-level workers will have been observed over a substantial period, and their capacity and willingness to absorb more training and handle more responsibility will have been assessed. To some extent, they may select themselves.

To institute such a flexible approach to recruitment and selection in a public agency, civil service requirements and practices will have to be revised. Experience shows that, if negotiation is undertaken in advance, changes can be introduced into the system.

In some cases, for example, civil service regulations have been temporarily waived. In such situations, new hires are considered to be on a trial basis for a stated period, at the end of which they must be able to qualify through examinations. In some cases, civil service systems have been willing to offer unassembled examinations. In others, the weight given to written examination scores has been reduced and offset by increased weight attached to specific personality factors. The precise method for dealing with civil service regulations will be determined by the job design and local conditions. The details are less important than the determination not to allow a plan to founder because of long-established rules. Without some changes, the result may be that either insufficient numbers will apply or that those who apply will fail to meet the requirements.

It must be assumed that, for an initial period, the productivity or effectiveness of these new personnel will not be substantial. In some cases, they may become just as effective just as quickly as persons with seemingly higher qualifications; in others, their effectiveness may depend on allowing a slower pace of development than might be expected from others. An abnormally high rate of turnover or failure to perform effectively should not be taken as evidence that nonprofessionals cannot function. Failures are part of any experiment, but the success of the experiment depends on the way in which failures are used to modify practices.

Training

Ultimately, the extent to which any correctional agency can utilize new sources and types of staff will depend on the quality of supervision and training available. Where training is a major commitment, the agency will be able to recruit and promote on the basis of potential rather than on performance standards.

The simple tasks designed for entry-level nonprofessionals can be taught in an informal manner, but the implications of even such tasks and the relationships to the work of the agency as well as the elementary procedures need to be learned. Small group discussions with staff members following a regular curriculum plus those which arise out of day-to-day occurrences can develop the entry workers' ability to function. The basic goals of corrections, the problems of confidentiality, and the legal status of the offender and the practical problems he faces are some of the subjects which need to be explored, even at the first level of nonprofessional employment. The basic goals of rehabilitation rather than punishment, fully understood, can indicate why it is important that a reception worker maintain a calm, friendly, reassuring attitude rather than the brusque, intimidating manner which tends to be associated with the minions of authority.

For successful work at an intermediate level, some elements of formal training may be suitable. Inservice training staff or outside facilities may be utilized. Agencies with large training facilities can rely on inside training to deal with the procedures and practices in corrections and rehabilitation. The training for aides in the broader socioeconomic issues or in general work techniques can utilize available outside sources. For example, training programs for employment aides have been established which deal with the nature of the job market and the individual's adjustment. Outside institutions can be the trainers in basic techniques of gathering and reporting information or of recreation group management. Cooperative training ventures between correctional agencies and others training nonprofessionals in the helping services might be of mutual benefit.

A basic principle underlying the success of training is that all facets—formal presentation, informal discussion groups, and on-the-job experience—be systematically related to each other at any given time. Theoretical materials completely unrelated to any other activity are almost without value. They need reinforcement in group discussion and practical experience. Formal or informal training in methods of gathering and recording data, for example, should be coordinated with on-the-job tasks concerned with data gathering. The training must be appropriate to the level of work with which the trainee is occupied. This means that both the training and the on-the-job experience must follow similar developmental patterns.

Particularly at the entry level, the emphasis must be on informal methods in preference to formal, didactic lectures. Such techniques as role playing, the case method, and the "T" group are good devices for acquainting the worker with the situation he can expect to face and for teaching him how to respond. A self-rating system may be useful. Through this system, the worker makes projections about what he thinks he can accomplish or what he thinks the offender group is like and then compares his assumptions with actual experience or group discussions.

Trainers themselves may have to be trained in order to employ such methods, and the entire professional staff, particularly those directly supervising nonprofessionals, may have to undergo some reorientation to understand the objectives of the program and their relationship to nonprofessionals. Otherwise, there may be a tendency for professional staff to utilize the nonprofessionals to a limited extent and to keep them permanently occupied in simple tasks which they can perform satisfactorily.

In addition to whatever special programs may be established with outside institutions, agencies may feel that nonprofessionals could profit from regular courses offered by outside institutions and may help finance such training. This would be particularly the case for workers employed at the third level who, in fact, might be enrolled in a full course of study. Some thought should be given to a systematic tuition refund or other type of continuing education program for those whose development requires additional education. In this area, some of the current or proposed experimentation with social-work curriculum at the undergraduate level or in special settings may be the answer.

Cooperative training efforts with college and professional schools are especially important if there is to be any connection between the semiprofessional and professional levels. For those newly created professional duties which the agency has developed itself, established courses in educational institutions can become part of the training of experienced semiprofessionals being considered for such professional roles. With regard to those professional roles that are defined not by the agency but by established professional disciplines, experimentation with the redesign of professional roles may contribute insights to the ongoing reappraisal of required training within those disciplines.

Evaluation

We have already discussed the need for continuing evaluation of workers in training for new nonprofessional and professional roles as the best method for determining which persons are suited for jobs. For purposes of such evaluation, it is necessary first to establish standards of competence. Short-term goals for worker performance can be set, against which actual progress can be measured.

In addition to such individual evaluations, it is also important to evaluate the new workers as a group for purposes of refining criteria of selection. Keeping data on the characteristics of those who fail will be as important as keeping data on those who succeed so that comparisons can be made and determinations reached regarding factors essential to performance.

It must be kept in mind, however, that failures also may be the result of deficiencies in assignment and training, as well as in the worker himself. Ongoing evaluation is, therefore, essential with respect to the job models. Some functions may have been improperly analyzed, so that the job description will need modification. Supervision and training may have been inadequate even if the job had been properly defined. Advance planning cannot anticipate all the effects of an innovation.

Part of the plan for implementing the models, therefore, should be the establishment of a unit whose responsibility is to assess what is taking place and to propose revisions in the structure of the models. A promising structure for this purpose is the "self-study" team. In addition to observing and interviewing the workers in the new jobs and their supervisors, the team also could analyze anecdotal material for training sessions, the reports of supervisors, and self-evaluation reports by the workers. The "self-study" team provides still another opportunity for career development of the nonprofessional, working closely with professionals.

These two levels of evaluation will be based, in large measure, on manpower considerations. In the final analysis, however, the primary concern of a correctional agency is to judge the effectiveness of its program on the offender population. In evaluating the use of new types of personnel, therefore, it must have standards not only for assessing new workers' competence but also for measuring the effect of their use on the client population. As a result of evaluation on this level, the agency may conclude that certain types of nonprofessionals should be used for certain types of roles. Although, as we have already stressed, considerations of this type are separate from manpower issues, nevertheless they will have manpower implications. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the program ought to shed light, for example, on new services that should be rendered. These, in turn, will lend themselves to the same functional analysis of manpower requirements as current services will.

It is clear, then, that an agency interested in implementing these models must be prepared to engage in operations research to test (1) the potential and performance of the worker, (2) the appropriateness of the models for maximizing his potential, and (3) his contribution to the achievement of the agency's goals.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY[1]

Adams, Stuart, and Calvin C. Hopkinson. *Interim Evaluation of the Intensive Supervision Caseload Project.* California: Los Angeles County Probation Department, Research Office. May 1964.

Adams, William T. *An Interstate Approach to Juvenile Delinquency: Research and Training—A Survey.* Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. August 1963.

Addicts Rehabilitation Center Fund, Inc. "Description of a Projected Rehabilitation Program for Drug Addicts: A Halfway House-Community Education Center in the Central Harlem Community." New York: The Fund. March 4, 1965. Mimeographed.

Arden House Conference on Manpower and Training for Corrections. "Decisions of the Arden House Conference, 1964," Harriman, N.Y. 1964. 30 pp.

Brewer, Jane L. "The Clerk Also Has an Important Part in Probation." *Federal Probation,* Vol. 19, No. 4 (July 1955). pp. 6–9.

California Board of Corrections. *Probation Supervision and Training.* Sacramento, Calif.: Office of State Printing. 1964.

California Department of Corrections. "Townhouse Program Progress Report No. 3." Chino, Calif.: California Institution for Men. No date. Mimeographed.

California Probation, Parole and Correctional Association. "The Practitioners in Corrections." California: The Association. Revised February 1964. Mimeographed.

———. "Towards an Ideal Curriculum for Practitioners in Correctional Settings." California: The Association. 1960. Mimeographed.

California Youth and Adult Corrections Agency. *Correction in the*

---

[1] In the preparation of this report, we reviewed much of the basic literature on the history, administration, and philosophy of corrections. We also examined statistical material and job descriptions. Some of this material is cited in footnotes, but none of it appears in the bibliography. Materials selected for the bibliography are those which relate primarily to manpower issues and to new careers for nonprofessionals. In addition, we have included selected materials describing programs discussed in the report.

Community: Alternatives to Incarceration. Monograph No. 4. Sacramento, Calif.: The Agency. June 1964.

California Youth Authority. *The Status of Current Research. Fifth Annual Report.* Sacramento, Calif.: The Authority. March 1965.

Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections, Southern Illinois University. *Training the Correctional Officer.* Transcript of Proceedings of a Preliminary Workshop held at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, October 28–30, 1964.

Class, Norris E. "Qualifications—A Realistic Approach to Personnel Requirements." *NPPA Journal,* Vol. 3, No. 2 (April 1957). pp. 107–110.

Committee on Corrections. *Perspectives and Guides in the Expansion of Social Work Education for the Correctional Field.* New York: Council on Social Work Education. 1958.

Draper Correctional Center. "Experimental and Demonstration Manpower Project for Training and Placement of Youthful Inmates of Draper Correctional Center at Elmore, Alabama." Progress Report. September–November 15, 1964. Elmore, Ala.: The Center. Mimeographed.

Empey, LaMar T., Maynard L. Erickson, and Max L. Scott. "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation." Fifth Annual Progress Report. 1963–1964. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University. Mimeographed.

Experiment in Culture Expansion. Report of Proceedings of a Conference on "The Use of Products of a Social Problem in Coping with the Problem," held at the California Rehabilitation Center, Norco, Calif., July 10–12, 1963. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Mental Health.

Federal Bureau of Prisons. *Basic Data Book.* Sixth Edition. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. October 1964.

———. "Pre-Release Guidance Centers for Federal Juvenile and Youth Offenders." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. July 15, 1961. Mimeographed.

———. *Rational Innovation.* Washington, D.C.: National Training School. October 1964.

———. "Treatment Management Changes at El Reno—1961." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. October 16, 1961. Mimeographed.

Fenton, Norman, ed. *Explorations in the Use of Group Counseling in the County Correctional Program.* Sacramento, Calif.: Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency. 1962.

——— "Group Counseling: A Preface to Its Use in Correctional and Welfare Agencies." Sacramento, Calif.: Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency. 1961.

French, David G. *Needed Research on Social Work Manpower.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Bureau of Family Services. 1964.

Galvin, John J. "Evaluative Statement Concerning El Reno Classification Team System." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Research and Development Division. March 1963. Mimeographed.

Gibbons, Don C. "Probation: Theory and Reality." *Canadian Journal of Corrections,* Vol. 11, No. 2 (January 1959). pp. 10–19.

Gilman, Merritt, and Alice M. Low. *Training for Juvenile Probation Officers: A Workshop Report.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Children's Bureau Publication No. 398. 1962.

Glaser, Daniel. *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System.* Kansas City, Mo.: Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc. 1964.

Grant, J. Douglas. "A Strategy for New Careers Development." Sacramento, Calif.: California Youth and Adult Corrections Agency. December 24, 1964. Mimeographed.

———. "New Careers Development Project: Operational Procedures." Sacramento, Calif.: California Department of Corrections. January 11, 1965. Mimeographed.

———. "New Careers for the Poor: Some Examples." Sacramento, Calif.: California Department of Corrections. October 26, 1964. Mimeographed.

Grant, Joan. "New Careers Development Project." Sacramento, Calif.: California Department of Corrections. September 23, 1964.

———. "The Industry of Discovery: New Roles for Nonprofessionals." Sacramento, Calif.: California Department of Corrections. No date. Mimeographed.

Gula, Martin. *Agency Operated Group Homes.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Children's Bureau Publication No. 416. 1964.

Harless, J. H. "Making Sow's-Ear-Writers into Silken Programmers." Paper presented at National Convention, National Society for Programmed Instruction, Philadelphia, Pa., May 6, 1956. Elmore, Ala.: Draper Correctional Center. Mimeographed.

Harrison, Robert M. "An Overview of Group Counseling in the California Department of Corrections." Paper presented at the 93rd Annual Congress of Correction of the American Correctional Association, Portland, Oreg., August 26, 1963. Sacramento, Calif.: California Youth and Adult Corrections Agency. Mimeographed.

——— and Paul F. C. Mueller. *Clue-Hunting about Group Counseling and Parole Outcome.* Research Report No. 11. Sacramento, Calif.: California Youth and Adult Corrections Agency, Research Division. May 1964.

Havel, Joan, and Elaine Sulka. *Special Intensive Parole Unit: Phase Three.* Research Report No. 3. Sacramento, Calif.: California Department of Corrections, Research Division. March 1962.

Howard University, Center for Youth and Community Studies. *Report on Community Apprentice Training Program.* Washington, D.C.: Howard University. October 1964.

Johnson, Elmer H. "The Professional in Corrections: Status and Prospects." *Social Forces,* Vol. 40 (December 1961). pp. 169–176.

Kassebaum, Gene G., David A. Word, and Daniel M. Wilner. *Group Treatment by Correctional Personnel: A Survey of the California Department of Corrections.* Monograph No. 3. Sacramento, Calif.: California Department of Corrections. January 1963.

Kennedy, Robert F. "Halfway Houses Pay Off." *Crime and Delinquency* (January 1964). pp. 1–7.

Leenhouts, Keith J. "The Volunteer's Role in Municipal Court Probation." *Crime and Delinquency* (January 1964). pp. 29–37.

Lejins, Peter P. "Aspects of Correctional Personnel Training." *Proceedings of the 85th Annual Congress of Correction of the American Correctional Association.* College Park, Md.: University of Maryland. 1955. pp. 190–197.

———. "Professional and Graduate Training in Corrections." *Proceedings of the 89th Annual Congress of Correction of the American Correctional Association.* College Park, Md.: University of Maryland. 1959. pp. 35–50.

———. "Recommended Pre-Service Training and Education to Qualify a Person to Enter Prison Service as a Custodial Officer." Paper presented at 81st Annual Congress of Correction, Biloxi, Miss., October 21–26, 1951. College Park, Md.: University of Maryland. 1951.

Lohman, Joseph D., Albert Wahl, and Robert M. Carter. *The San Francisco Project: A Study of Federal Probation and Parole.* Research Report No. 1. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California, School of Criminology. April 1965.

Lytle, Milford B. "The Unpromising Client." *Crime and Delinquency,* Vol. 10 (April 1964). pp. 130–134.

McKee, John M. "A Treatment Culture for the Convict Culture." Paper presented at the 94th Annual Congress of Correction, Kansas City, Mo., September 1, 1964. Elmore, Ala.: Draper Correctional Center. 1964.

———. "The Draper Experiment: A Programmed Learning Project." Gabriel D. Ofiesh and Wesley C. Meierhenry, eds. *Trends in Programmed Instruction.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Department of Audiovisual Instruction. 1964. pp. 92–97.

McNickle, Roma K., ed. *Pacific Coast Institute on Correctional Manpower and Training.* Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. May 1965.

Meeker, Ben S. "Expansion of Field Work and Internship Facilities for the Training of Correctional Personnel." Arden House Conference on Manpower and Training for Corrections, Harriman, N.Y., June 24–26, 1964. Chicago, Ill.: Department of Probation. 1964.

———. "Federal Probation Training Center Exemplifies Agency Responsibility for Training." Paper presented during Council on Social Work Education, Tenth Annual Program Meeting, St. Louis, Mo., January 17–20, 1962. Chicago, Ill.: Department of Probation. 1962.

Michigan Crime and Delinquency Council. *The Saginaw Probation Demonstration Project.* New York: National Council on Crime and Delinquency. 1963.

Michigan Department of Corrections. *Handbook for . . . Volunteer Group Counselors.* Lansing, Mich.: The Department. No date. Pamphlet. 21 pp.

Miles, Arthur P. *A Time Study of Wisconsin Probation and Parole Agents.* Madison Wis.: State Department of Public Welfare, Division of Corrections. March 1964.

National Association of Social Workers. *Utilization of Personnel in Social Work.* New York: The Association. 1962.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. "Standards for Selection of Probation and Parole Personnel." New York: The Council. Revised 1961. Mimeographed.

———. *Probation and Parole Directory, United States and Canada.* 14th edition. New York: The Council. 1963.

National Training School for Boys. "Demonstration Counseling Project." First Annual Report, October 15, 1961–October 15, 1962. Washington, D.C.: National Training School. 1962. Mimeographed.

New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, Division of Correction and Parole. "Essexfields Group Rehabilitation Center, Annual Report." Newark, N.J.: The Department. June 30, 1963. Mimeographed.

Ohlin, Lloyd E., Herman Piven, and Donnel M. Pappenfort. "Major Dilemmas of Social Workers in Probation and Parole." *NPPA Journal*, Vol 2, No. 3 (July 1956). pp. 211–225.

Pearl, Arthur, and Frank Riessman. *New Careers for the Poor.* New York: Free Press. 1965.

Pennsylvania Board of Parole. *A Time Study of Parole Agents.* Harrisburg, Pa.: The Board. March 1961.

Perrow, Charles. *The Resident Home Program.* A report prepared for the Michigan Department of Corrections and the McGregor Fund. Lansing, Mich.: The Department. July 1963.

Pye, A. Kenneth, George W. Shadoan, and Joseph M. Snee. *A Preliminary Survey of the Federal Probation System.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Law Center. March 4, 1963.

Reckless, Walter C. "The Impact of Correctional Programmes on Inmates." *British Journal of Delinquency*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (September 1955). pp. 138–147.

Reiff, Robert, and Frank Riessman. *The Indigenous Nonprofessional: A Strategy of Change in Community Action and Community Mental Health Programs.* Report No. 3. New York: National Institute of Labor Education. 1965.

Samuels, Gertrude. "Where Junkies Learn to Hang Tough." *New York Times Magazine.* May 9, 1965.

Studt, Elliot. *Education for Social Workers in the Correctional Field.* New York: Council on Social Work Education. 1959.

Torrance, E. Paul, A. O. Prakash, Gargi Luthre, and Conchita Tan. "Evaluation of the Juvenile Court Judges Institute, the Juvenile Officers Institute and the Principals Workshop on Problems of the Economically and Culturally Deprived Child." Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota, Extension Division, Center for Continuation Study. October 1964. Mimeographed.

University of North Carolina, Training Center on Delinquency and Youth Crime. "A Progress Report. July 1, 1963–June 30, 1964." Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University. July 31, 1964. Mimeographed.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Training Personnel for Work with Juvenile Delinquents.* Washington, D.C.: The Department, Children's Bureau Publication No. 348. 1954.

———. *Staff Training for Personnel in Institutions for Juvenile Delinquents.* Washington, D.C.: The Department, Children's Bureau Publication No. 364. 1958.

Van Buskirk, David E. "Correctional Education through Electronic Data Processing." *American Journal of Corrections* (January–February 1964).

Wahl, Albert, and Daniel Glaser. "A Pilot Time Study of the Federal Probation Officer's Job." *Federal Probation,* Vol. 27, No. 3 (September 1963). pp. 20–25.

Wallace, John. "A Fresh Look at Old Probation Standards." *Crime and Delinquency* (April 1964). pp. 124–129.

Warren, Marguerite Q. "An Experiment in Alternatives to Incarceration for Delinquent Youth: Recent Findings in the Community Treatment Project." Reprint from Monograph No. 4. Sacramento, Calif.: California State Board of Corrections. June 1964.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. *The Mountain States Institute on Expansion of Correctional Field Placements and Internships.* Brighton, Utah, March 18–20, 1964. Boulder, Colo: The Commission. February 1964.

Wisconsin School for Girls. *A Handbook for Youth Counselors.* Oregon, Wis.: State Department of Public Welfare, Division of Public Welfare. No date.

Witte, Ernest F. "Expanding Educational Facilities for Social Work Manpower." Position paper submitted for Preparatory Conference on Manpower for Corrections. San Diego, Calif.: San Diego State College. June 1964.

———. "The Purposes of Undergraduate Education for Social Welfare." Paper presented at Council on Social Work Education, Annual Program Meeting, San Diego, Calif. New York: Council on Social Work Education. January 1965.

Yablonsky, Lewis. *The Tunnel Back: Synanon.* New York: The Macmillan Co. 1965.

Younghusband, Eileen L. "Report on a Survey of Social Work in the Field of Corrections." *Social Work Education,* Vol. 8 (August 1960). Supplement.

Youth Service Bureau of Chicago. "A Descriptive Study in the Use of Volunteers as Counselors: September 1958–August 1961." Chicago, Ill.: Department of Social Welfare and Church Federation of Greater Chicago. Mimeographed.

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1966—214-138